

**CHRIST AND HUMAN NEED**

**1921**



# CHRIST AND HUMAN NEED 1921

BEING ADDRESSES DELIVERED AT A  
CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL AND  
MISSIONARY QUESTIONS, GLASGOW  
JANUARY 4TH TO 9TH, 1921

LONDON  
STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT  
32 RUSSELL SQUARE, W.C.1  
1921

### *EDITORIAL NOTE*

THE rapid appearance of this Report has only been made possible by the willing co-operation of speakers and printer, and their response to the troublesome demands of an insistent editor. It is on the editor, therefore, that the blame must be laid if any signs of haste or inadequate revision appear in these pages. But indeed they matter little since the Report is here so soon to carry on the work begun by the Conference, while it is still a fresh and living memory.

H. M.

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
PROGRAMME . . . . .	vii
AN IMPRESSION OF THE CONFERENCE . . . . .	xiii
The Rev. C. E. RAVEN, B.D., sometime Dean of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.	
THE NEED AND POSSIBILITY OF A NEW WORLD . . . . .	I
Rt. Hon. VISCOUNT GREY of Fallodon.	
INDIA IN TRANSITION. . . . .	13
The Rev. A. G. FRASER, Kandy.	
THE CHALLENGE OF CHINA . . . . .	27
The Rev. NELSON BITTON, London Missionary Society.	
AFRICA AND THE AFRICANS . . . . .	37
The Rev. DONALD FRASER, Livingstonia.	
IS CHRISTENDOM FIT FOR A WORLD TASK ?	
(1) The Industrial System . . . . .	47
KENNETH MACLENNAN.	
(2) The Relations between Christian Nations . . . . .	62
Miss MAUDE ROYDEN.	
THE CONTACTS OF THE WEST WITH ASIA AND AFRICA	
(1) Through Commerce and the Professions . . . . .	74
Sir HENRY E. E. PROCTER, Bombay. E. C. CARTER, Y.M.C.A.	

THE CONTACTS OF THE WEST WITH ASIA AND AFRICA  
(continued)

- (2) Through Government . . . . . 90  
Sir WM. MARRIS, K.C.S.I., Governor-Elect of Assam.

- (3) Social Contacts between Races . . . . . 105  
The Rev. FRANK LENWOOD, London Missionary Society.

- (4) The Missionary and the Growing Church . . . 117  
WILLIAM PATON, Missionary Secretary, Student  
Christian Movement.

- GOD THE SUPREME REALITY . . . . . 127  
J. H. OLDHAM.

- THE TEACHING OF JESUS ABOUT THE KINGDOM OF  
GOD . . . . . 141  
R. H. TAWNEY.  
The Rev. A. H. GRAY, D.D.

- THE CHURCH AND THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS . . 160  
The Rt. Rev. F. T. WOODS, Bishop of Peterborough.

- THE CROSS . . . . . 174  
The Very Rev. W. M. MACGREGOR, D.D.

- THE POWER OF GOD IN HUMAN LIFE. . . . . 186  
The Rev. W. R. MALTBY.

- APPENDIX . . . . . 199

# PROGRAMME

TUESDAY, JANUARY 4th.

## Evening Session.

MEETING FOR INTERCESSION FOR THE CONFERENCE.

Led by A. G. PITE, Trinity College, Cambridge.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 5th.

## Morning Session.

CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS.

The Rev. W. P. YOUNG, M.A., M.C., D.C.M.

"THE NEED AND POSSIBILITY OF A NEW  
WORLD."

The Rt. Hon. VISCOUNT GREY of Fallodon.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS FROM OTHER LANDS.

The Rev. TISSINGTON TATLOW, General Secretary, Student  
Christian Movement.

SERVICE OF INTERCESSION FOR THE WORLD'S STUDENT  
CHRISTIAN FEDERATION.

Miss RUTH ROUSE, Secretary, World's Student Christian  
Federation.

## *Simultaneous Meetings.*

"THE CONTACTS OF THE WEST WITH ASIA AND  
AFRICA."

(I) THROUGH COMMERCE AND THE PROFESSIONS.

Sir HENRY E. E. PROCTER, Bombay.

Mr E. C. CARTER, Y.M.C.A.

**"THE UNIVERSALITY OF CHRIST."****(1) THE COMPARATIVE METHOD.**

The Rev. CANON TEMPLE, Bishop-Elect of Manchester.

**"SKETCHES OF MISSIONARY LIFE."****(1) WINNING AN AFRICAN PEOPLE.**

The Rev. E. F. SPANTON, U.M.C.A.

**Afternoon Session.**

MEETING FOR DELEGATES FROM THE CONTINENT:—

**"THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WORLD'S STUDENT CHRISTIAN FEDERATION."**

Mons. H. L. HENRIOD, Switzerland.

Mlle. SUSANNE BIDGRAIN, France.

**"IS CHRISTENDOM FIT FOR A WORLD TASK?"****(1) OUR INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM.**

Mr KENNETH MACLENNAN, London.

**Evening Session.****"GOD THE SUPREME REALITY."**

Mr J. H. OLDHAM, London.

**THURSDAY, JANUARY 6th.****Morning Session.****"INDIA IN TRANSITION."**

The Rev. A. G. FRASER, Kandy.

**SERVICE OF INTERCESSION FOR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.**

The Rev. C. C. B. BARDSLEY, Church Missionary Society.

***Simultaneous Meetings.*****"THE CONTACTS OF THE WEST WITH ASIA AND AFRICA."****(2) THROUGH GOVERNMENT.**

Sir WILLIAM MARRIS, K.C.S.I., Governor-Elect of Assam.

**"THE UNIVERSALITY OF CHRIST"**

(2) IS A UNIVERSAL RELIGION POSSIBLE?

The Rev. CANON TEMPLE.

**"SKETCHES OF MISSIONARY LIFE."**

(2) BUILDING THE MEDICAL PROFESSION OF CHINA.

Dr HAROLD BALME, F.R.C.S.(Eng.), D.P.H.(Lond.), China.

**Afternoon Session.**

**"IS CHRISTENDOM FIT FOR A WORLD TASK?"**

(2) THE RELATIONS BETWEEN CHRISTIAN NATIONS.

Miss MAUDE ROYDEN, London.

**Evening Session.**

**"THE TEACHING OF JESUS ABOUT THE KINGDOM OF GOD."**

Mr R. H. TAWNEY.

The Rev. A. H. GRAY, D.D., Glasgow.

**FRIDAY, JANUARY 7th.**

**Morning Session.**

**"THE CHALLENGE OF CHINA."**

The Rev. NELSON BITTON, London Missionary Society.

**SERVICE OF INTERCESSION FOR THE MISSIONARY WORK OF THE CHURCH.**

The Rev. W. STEVENSON, D.D., Gargunnoch.

*Simultaneous Meetings.*

**"THE CONTACTS OF THE WEST WITH ASIA AND AFRICA."**

(3) SOCIAL CONTACT BETWEEN RACES.

The Rev. F. LENWOOD, London Missionary Society.

**"THE UNIVERSALITY OF CHRIST."**

(3) CHRIST THE COMPLETE REVELATION.

The Rev. CANON TEMPLE.

**"SKETCHES OF MISSIONARY LIFE."****(3) THE MISSIONARY AND INDIAN STUDENT LIFE.**

The Rev. W. E. S. HOLLAND, Calcutta.

**Afternoon Session.**

MEETING FOR DELEGATES FROM THE CONTINENT:—

**"DOES MATERIALISM PRESENT A POSSIBLE BASIS FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF SOCIETY IN EUROPE?"**

His Holiness the ARCHIMANDRITE SCRIBAN, Roumania.

**"THE PROBLEM OF CHRISTIAN RE-UNION: THE LEAD FROM THE MISSION FIELD."**

Mr J. H. OLDHAM, London.

**"THE HISTORY OF THE STUDENT VOLUNTEER MISSIONARY UNION."**

The Rev. TISSINGTON TATLOW, General Secretary.

**Evening Session.****"THE CHURCH AND THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS."**

The Rt. Rev. F. T. WOODS, Bishop of Peterborough.

**SATURDAY, JANUARY 8th.****Morning Session.****"AFRICA AND THE AFRICANS."**

Rev. DONALD FRASER, Livingstonia.

SERVICE OF INTERCESSION FOR THE CHURCH.

The Rt. Rev. E. S. TALBOT, Bishop of Winchester.

*Simultaneous Meetings.***"THE CONTACTS OF THE WEST WITH ASIA AND AFRICA."****(4) THE MISSIONARY AND THE GROWING CHURCH.**

The Rev. WILLIAM PATON, Missionary Secretary, Student Christian Movement.

**"THE UNIVERSALITY OF CHRIST."**

**(4) DOES CHRISTIANITY WORK?**

The Rev. CANON TEMPLE.

**Afternoon Session.**

MEETING FOR STUDENTS FROM THE CONTINENT :—

**"DOES CHRISTIANITY PRESENT A POSSIBLE  
BASIS FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF  
SOCIETY IN EUROPE"?**

Professor KOEHLER, Zurich.

*Simultaneous Meetings.*

**"TYPES OF WORK ABROAD."**

**(a) THE MEANING OF EVANGELISTIC WORK.**

The Rev. H. W. OLDHAM, China.

**(b) THE SIGNIFICANCE OF EDUCATIONAL MISSIONS.**

Miss M. ALLAN, Homerton College, Cambridge.

The Rev. F. J. WESTERN, India.

**(c) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS IN MISSIONARY WORK :  
CO-OPERATIVE BANKS:**

The Rev. J. GRANT, India.

**(d) THE DOCTOR AS MISSIONARY.**

The Rev. J. W. ARTHUR, M.D., Kikuyu.

**(e) WORK IN THE COLONIES.**

The Rev. E. E. WINTER, Mirfield.

**(f) CIVILIAN SERVICE.**

The Rev. W. P. YOUNG.

**Evening Session.**

**"THE CROSS."**

The Very Rev. W. M. MACGREGOR, D.D., Glasgow.

**SUNDAY, JANUARY 9th.****Afternoon Session.****"THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE  
WORLD SITUATION."**

Members of the U.S.A. Delegation.

**MEETING FOR DELEGATES FROM THE CONTINENT.**

Chairman—F. DE ROUGEMONT, Switzerland.

**"RESOURCES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE  
UNIVERSITIES."****(a) OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE.**

Mr ERNEST BARKER, King's College, London.

**(b) LONDON UNIVERSITY.**

Dr A. H. GRAY.

**(c) THE ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES.**

Professor P. M. ROXBY, Liverpool University.

**(d) THE SCOTTISH UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES.**

The Rev. D. S. CAIRNS, D.D.

The Rev. C. W. G. TAYLOR.

**(e) THE IRISH UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES.**

The Rev. T. TATLOW.

**(f) THE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES OF WALES.**

The Rev. HERBERT MORGAN, Aberystwyth.

**(g) THE TRAINING COLLEGES.**

Miss M. ALLAN, Homerton College, Cambridge.

**(h) THE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGES.**

The Rev. H. ST B. HOLLAND.

The Rev. J. G. TASKER, D.D.

**Evening Session.****"THE POWER OF GOD IN HUMAN LIFE."**

The Rev. W. R. MALTBY.

## AN IMPRESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

The Rev. C. E. RAVEN

"GLASGOW 1921" will stand unique among the conferences of the student world; and that for many reasons. In the first place, it was the largest ever gathered by the British Student Christian Movement: "I did not know that there were so many Christians in Great Britain," said Mr Tawney, when he stood up and saw his audience. Two thousand delegates from these islands; over a hundred from other lands; four hundred and eighty-eight visitors from the Staffs of Colleges, the Missionary Societies, and the various religious organizations; these combined to form an audience larger even than that which met at Liverpool in 1912. Thirty-five nations, not counting our own islands, were represented; an Archimandrite from Roumania, a Professor and nine others from Hungary, eight Austrians, two Italians, twenty-four from France, two from Serbia, many Danes and Norwegians and Swedes—these were among the guests whom Mr Tatlow presented to the Conference. In addition there were Africans, Egyptians, Indians, Burmans, Cingalese, Chinese, Japanese, Koreans—a multitude of all peoples, nations, and languages drawn together for common counsel by their allegiance to a common Lord.

And if the gathering was vast and complex, it was strangely and splendidly one: one in the earnestness of its attention: one in its fearless desire to face facts: one in its appreciation alike of the gravity of the issues,

and of the source of the power in which they must be met. The memory of that great hall, packed in floor and galleries and platform with tense and responsive faces, will live long for those who saw it. The air of expectancy and seriousness with which they settled down to listen, and the alertness and sympathy which created an atmosphere of the closest intimacy between speakers and audience, made it certain at once that the message of the Conference would get home.

And as far as any human utterance is adequate to such an occasion and such a theme, the speeches were worthy of their audience. Lord Grey, with his closely reasoned sentences, stripped bare of all rhetoric and delivered with a steady and deliberate calm, set a high standard from the first. Fearlessly outspoken as was the treatment of every topic, strong as were the feelings with which the various races received the record of British failure and British aspirations, quick as the audience was to grasp each point, and to detect any evasion, the speeches rang true. Their manifest sincerity compelled admiration, even when their outlook challenged established convictions. We listened and learned—even when the lesson was most damaging to our national pride.

#### THE CRISIS

Expectancy—wistful eagerness—absence of all desire for self-justification, amounting at times to a sense of burning shame and utter penitence! As our shortcomings were laid bare, the gulf between our profession, which is also in a very real sense our ideal, and our practice exposed, as a ruthless, sometimes almost a lurid light was flung upon our blindness and our error, it was amazing with what patience, with what humility, the indictment was received. Whatever may be the power

of the present generation to possess the earth for their Master, at least they have a large measure of that quality which is the first qualification for their task. They want truth ; and if speakers did not always escape the peril so faithfully described by Lord Grey, of allowing the pull of a great audience to lead them into exaggerations, at least the strength and, in the main, the sincerity of their criticism enabled us to strip off those garments of complacency which we dignify by the title of self-respect.

There was in use among the Chaplains in France a Litany of self-examination which some irreverent padre nicknamed the "Creeping Barrage." Here was such a barrage in action in a sphere as wide as the world : India, China, Africa, Central Europe, Ireland, Industry, the Social Order, the Churches, Ourselves—there was no corner left wherein we could shelter our pride. India, with its age-long faiths crumbling beneath the impact of the West, and its people driven by the culminating tyranny of the Punjab to replace them not by the Christ, but the creed of blood and iron ; China, whose ancient virility and deliberate repudiation of force contrasts so powerfully with our creed of sacrifice and policy of egoism ; Central Europe, with its tragedy trenchantly suggested by the collection of clothes for Viennese students, and the recital of a memorandum on German missions ; Ireland, never indeed discussed but never absent, to supply the parallel to more distant failures ; Industry, where honest aspiration is entrapped in a labyrinth of materialism, and becomes at last the prey of the Minotaur of greed ; the Churches, whose worth is weighed by their attitude towards " Foreign Missions " and their response to the call of the world ; Ourselves, lest we be tempted to the easy task of vicarious penance, to the blaming of organizations or politicians or the older generations, for whom there is the bitter knowledge that " we can do it,

*if we will,"* and that at present we are leaving it undone. Count by count the charge is laid—count by count it is summed up fairly and with full allowance for all that can be urged in our defence. And the verdict comes inevitably. It is not that we have failed to live up to the high standards of the Christian ethic, but that we have deliberately accepted and propagated throughout the earth a policy based on the exact reversal of that ethic.

Many of us have expressed a fear that the student generation had lost the sense of sin, and losing it was missing the significance of the Cross and the possibility of salvation. No one who was present at Glasgow could fail to recognize that here, reached, maybe, by unconventional methods, by a fresh but potent evangelism, was the same authentic conviction of disease and helplessness and shame, the same penitence, the same humiliation—the same, yet with the added burden of corporate as well as of individual guilt.

### THE CALL

Yet if our penitence was complete it was also singularly healthy and sincere. Only once or twice, during the whole tragic story of our failure, was there a trace of the morbid or the hysterical. That great audience was not being challenged to a paroxysm of emotional self-loathing: it was being asked coldly and sanely to recognize and face the facts. Nothing was more striking than the candour of our self-examination except its calm. On the rare occasions when speakers were tempted to stampede their audience by an appeal to their feelings instead of their intelligence, the attempt was resented and repulsed. The atmosphere was one of sincerity, of a desire for truth, and of a conviction

that exaggeration was as great a sin as concealment. Sensationalism and sentimentality were seldom, very seldom, to be detected—a fact little short of amazing, in view of the tense expectancy of the audience and the emotional possibilities of the subject.

And the source of this sanity and self-control was plain. Along with the call to penitence came always the call to adventure. If we were shown fearlessly and frankly the record of our failure, and the immensity of our task, our imagination was never allowed to dwell for long in the dungeons of despair. We were saved from the perils of self-pity, from the paralysis which luxuriates in its own disease, by the challenge to our courage, by the confidence of our comradeship. It was an audience which had learnt to face its own weakness in the long agonies of war; to know its helplessness under the stress of bombardment; to face the future in the security of fellowship. And that high quality, which could survive the chill and panics of the zero-hour, could face the knowledge of its own shame, the prospect of world-wide disaster, the summons to ultimate surrender, open-eyed and undismayed. Along with the recognition and confession of our guilt, we experienced once again something of the elation of those who, having seen their own souls stripped bare in the presence of death, and having known the bitterness of terror without and betrayal within, can go forward cheerful in the certainty that the worst is over. "Be strong, my heart, ere this worse fate was thine"; the words of the venturer of old will be re-echoed by this generation as it stands confronted with world-bankruptcy and chaos.

And the appeal was intensely romantic. Here, at last, Christendom knows itself to be standing with its back to the wall; here and now it must strive in what will be for this generation the decisive struggle, and,

but for the strength of God, might be the ultimate defeat. Great times come—prepared through centuries—when the alternative stands clear, and the choice can neither be evaded nor delayed. As we listened to the facts of the present situation, we were sure that this was such a time, that here and now we must be utterly true or utterly false. And as we listened, conscious the while of our own impotence, of the demands upon us, of the hideous likelihood of failure, there were moments when the adventure gripped us, when we felt that even for us failure, the great refusal, was impossible. The representatives of the nations were listening. We of this country in their presence were shown the measure of our failure, the magnitude of our responsibility; and in their presence were challenged to consecrate ourselves for service.

Yet if we cannot write of it without emotion, if we cannot look back without a thrill, such sensations at the time were severely repressed. Calmly and dispassionately as befits a summons to sacrifice, without rhetoric or passion, oftentimes rather by suggestion than in words, the challenge was uttered. We were invited by the logic of facts to realize our duty; we were allowed to see the need of the world; we were warned of the cost of obedience; and then we were left to make our reply.

#### THE CHRIST

And the secret of our repentance and of our hope was plain from the first. Only in the presence of God can men experience the paradoxes of the Sermon on the Mount; only against the background of eternity can they see life steadily and see it whole; only under the shadow of the Cross can they learn the lesson of meekness, of dying to live.

From the first, too, there was a double presentation of the Christ. Lord Grey had insisted that our task was twofold, that alongside of an improvement in external conditions must go a change of heart in ourselves. And throughout the Conference both tasks were kept in mind. We had over and over again the picture of Christ as the hope of the world; Christ Who could alone save India from racial hatred and strife: Christ in Whom China would find the vindication of her ancient ethic, and redemption from opium and morphia, from materialism and greed: Christ in Whose service Africa and the backward peoples shall gain their perfect freedom: Christ Whose Spirit can accomplish the renewal and the perfecting of mankind: Christ in Whom for all the nations is revealed the Universality of God. But there was Christ also as the hope of the individual soul: Christ Who knows us in all our shame—and loves us still: Christ, God's great adventure, Who has overcome the world, and shall in us overcome it again: Christ Whose hands and feet and side warn us of the cost of service: Christ Whose deathless life gives the power for its payment: "Christ the beginning; for the end is Christ."

*10th January, 1921*



## THE NEED AND POSSIBILITY OF A NEW WORLD

VISCOUNT GREY

THIS Christian Students' Union is a Movement in this country which is in connection with Movements of the same kind on the same principles in other countries. I was first brought into contact with it when I was in the United States last year. I promised then a gentleman named Mr John Mott, whom I had met before I was in the United States and for whom I had conceived great respect and regard, that I would address the great meeting of the Students' Union in the United States which was to take place, and did take place, at Des Moines, in Ohio. I was prevented from fulfilling that engagement because I left the United States before the meeting took place and I had to cancel the engagement. I am in a sense fulfilling here to-day the engagement which I had entered into in the United States last year. I am told that at that meeting in the United States there were some 8000 persons present. That will give you an impression of the importance which this Movement has assumed in the United States, and of the immense influence for good which may be exercised by this Students' Union throughout the world if it acts up to its ideals.

Now I have been asked to speak to you on the question of "Whether a New World is Possible and Desirable." At one of the first schools at which I attended, the master used occasionally to ask his class questions which we were

unable to answer. When we had proved unable to answer the questions, he told us the object in asking the question was to make us think. Well, I don't propose to answer this question as definitely as you may wish, but it is a question which we should all put to ourselves, because it is one which stimulates thoughts, thoughts which may be very helpful to us in the part we take in the public affairs of our respective countries in life. A new world in one sense is not possible, not in the sense of being a world entirely different from the present, which has broken with all the traditions of the past. I don't think that is humanly possible, but a better world is undoubtedly desirable, and is undoubtedly possible. That depends upon ourselves. But it is becoming more and more clear that the making of a better world depends not only upon one country, but upon the efforts of all countries combined. That is essential, and that is one reason why you want Movements of this kind which will not be limited to one country, but shall have corresponding activities in other countries also. If you want a better world we must bear in mind that change of external conditions will not alone produce a better world. There is plenty of room for change in external conditions, a better distribution of wealth, more equal opportunities in life for people of all classes. Those are changes for which many people are working. I would not say a word to discourage any real progress in the direction of improving external conditions, but bear in mind all the time that improvement of external conditions alone is not going to make a better world. There must go with it improvement, a deepening and strengthening, of the moral feelings of the people. This week you are going to approach the discussion of political questions from the point of view of Christianity. That is right. All of us who are Christians must approach public questions from that point of view, but it is not the

easiest point of view from which to approach them. It is no good concealing from ourselves—indeed the first business is to recognize—the facts we have to deal with ; and the facts with which we have to deal are that the national policies—I use the word in the plural—of Christian countries have been and still are lamentably deficient in the Christian spirit. That is the first fact.

The second fact is, that though it is absolutely true that you will only get improvement by bringing more of the Christian spirit into these national policies, there is still great difficulty in reconciling the demands of national policies with the Christian spirit. The Christian spirit is one of seeking the common good and of unselfishness ; the condition between nations is one of competition. Any man who takes office in a Government is bound to face that competition. It is part of the condition under which he enters the Government—to make it his first object to promote the interests of his own country. He will not be called upon to use any methods which are foul or unfair or dishonourable. That happily is not necessary ; but he will be called upon to take part in that competition between the nations from the point of view of promoting the interests of his own country, and of course competition means that the policies of nations engaged in competition are apt to lose sight of the common good in pursuing their own particular national interest. That is not reconcilable, or not reconciled, with the Christian spirit of seeking the common good and unselfishness, and the question we have got to put to ourselves is this : Are we to-day getting nearer to bringing more of the Christian spirit into national policies, or are we getting further away, and if we are not getting nearer to doing it, how can we so affect the course of things that we shall get nearer to doing it ?

You are going to discuss especially this week the relations between East and West. I shall have a word

to say about the consequences of the war presently, but no doubt one of the consequences of the war has been, in certain ways, to give a fairer start, and I regard the establishment of the League of Nations, with its doctrine of mandates, as something which is going to be of real assistance in improving the government of those parts, for instance of Africa, which are still absolutely uncivilized and which are in the occupation of European countries. Let us start now from this moment in encouraging the doctrine of mandates in this sense, that Governments which take over any uncivilized territory should take them over as a responsibility and under certain conditions, and should be under an obligation to prove to the Council of the League of Nations, year by year, that they are fulfilling these obligations. And roughly, these obligations would come under two great heads. First of all to show that the revenue raised in the country is spent for the good of the country, and next to show that while you are promoting the material development of those at present undeveloped countries in Africa, you are not resorting to any methods which go to cause hardship to the population or injury to your own character. It is much better that the development of these countries should go slowly than that you should resort to such things as forced labour in order to make the development go fast, and I would like it to result, that this doctrine of mandates should be made a reality by the public opinion of the different countries, and should be a new guarantee against some of the abuses which have taken place in previous years in uncivilized parts of the world. That is comparatively simple.

A much more difficult question with regard to the relations of East and West is the problem raised by such countries as India and Egypt. These are countries with an intellectual culture and ancient civilization of their

own. I will take as an instance the difficulty with regard to Egypt, although what I say about Egypt has its application also to some other countries. We are aware to-day to an extent to which we were not aware before the war of the difficulty of the contact between East and West in such countries as Egypt and India. I think with regard to Egypt, in fact I am sure, that during the British occupation, compared with the state of things which existed in Egypt before we went there, the finances have been placed on a much sounder footing; the material development of the country has greatly increased; the administration of justice has been greatly improved, and the poorer classes have been protected from an oppression to which they were exposed before the British occupation. These things I am sure are true. Why then do we have a problem? We have a problem, because though all that is true, the result has not been the contentment or the reconciliation of the population to the British occupation.

And one begins to ask oneself the question—If all the good you do in a country is not the particular sort of good that country appreciates or wants; if it does not produce the goodwill and the contentment of the population, what is the good of going on with your work? Well, you may say there is an answer to that at this stage. If you are convinced that the work you are doing is good, even though you do not feel you are getting credit for it, ought you not to go on doing it? But that does not really answer the question. The real crux of the matter is this, that however well you may begin by governing a country, you cannot permanently govern well by force. You may have force—you must have force sufficient to make the decisions of the Government respected—to put down any particular risings, but unless you have the goodwill of the population you cannot go on doing your job well, and that is the real difficulty with which we are faced to-day.

If you have not got the goodwill of the population, however good your intentions, however able you may be, you cannot make a good thing of the government of the country. And therefore you will have to admit one of two things—either that you are attempting the impossible, or that there is something wrong in your methods which needs to be altered.

I am not going to discuss any of these things exhaustively in this opening address, but I would put to you this question—Is it not possible that the fact of the war having taken place in Europe has made things more difficult for Western civilization in such countries as Egypt and India? We used to be told often before the war that our power of doing good work in these countries and our position depended greatly upon prestige. Is it not the case that the effect of the European war has immensely diminished the prestige of Christian civilization in these countries which have a civilization of their own and which are in the main non-Christian? For us in Europe it is relevant enough to discuss between the different countries who took part in the war, which was responsible for the outbreak of the war and which was to blame. We may discuss that, and any particular country may clear its own character for being to blame for the outbreak of the war. But looked at from the point of view of some one belonging to a non-Christian oriental country, who has been told that Christian civilization has been a great advance and influence, that but for a small portion of the South-East, Europe has been a country of Christian civilization for centuries, and then looks at the fact that the outcome has been a Continental war entailing calamities and horrors on a scale never known in the record of history, is it not certain that a spectacle like that must have diminished the prestige of Christian civilization in other countries? If the relations between the East and the West

are to improve, the foundation of it first of all must be to restore the prestige of Europe. And you can only do that by showing that, great as the calamity of the war has been, you are going, as the outcome of the war, to have something which is better, more stable, more moral, more Christian in spirit than the state of things which existed before the war. If you can do that, you may repair the moral damage of the war, but it is essential that you should do that. Can you do it? Are there any signs that it is going to be done? For us who have been at close quarters with the war, there are some noble things connected with it which must always be a stimulus to us. I suppose nearly all of us in this country have known individuals young in years who gave their lives in the war, who before they gave their lives had given evidence not only of physical but moral heroism, rising to heights which we had not known or suspected in some of them before—rising to heights, the memory of which will always kindle our faith and strengthen us to the end of our lives. That is for ourselves something never to forget.

What you have to look at from the point of view of which I have been speaking is not that, but whether Europe is showing signs of being better or not since the war. Well, there are some things which are unfavourable. It is true that some parts of Europe have been set free from the rule of a race which was alien to them and which they did not like. But on the whole, especially in some of those countries which were the freest before the war, even in our own country, there is more violence and less liberty than before the war. Now what is one of the signs of civilization? It is order and liberty combined, and where you have more disorder and less liberty you have got a set-back in civilization. That is a symptom at present which may well give us cause for thought and

anxiety. I trust it is a passing one, but it is part of the reaction of the war.

But there are other things which are more favourable. The war has shown us not only what war at present is, but what war is going to be in the future. It has shown us that in a future war one of the great factors will be the starving, the bombing, and the poisoning of great centres of population, and the moral lesson of that is that nations must combine together to prevent war in future. I have said "a moral lesson of the war," it is really like an ultimatum to Christian civilization to prevent war in the future. If they cannot prevent war their civilization will perish. But I do believe that it is and must be one result of the war that there should be a feeling amongst the nations such as there was not before, that they must combine together and get into council together to prevent a future war. If that be so, have you not got one step further forward towards co-operation instead of competition between nations? Have not you gained this much, that those who think only of the material benefits to nations will be convinced that even from the material point of view it is essential that nations should co-operate together to keep the peace. That may help to smooth the path of co-operation between nations—the fact that instead of a feeling of conflict between the material and the moral point of view, there is going to be an agreement between them.

And the same thing is beginning to show itself in commerce. I said yesterday<sup>1</sup> that we were a country poorer to-day than we were before, and that we were part of a continent that was even more impoverished than we were, and we were anxious about the future of our trade at this moment, and we were anxious to see the

<sup>1</sup> On the occasion of the presentation to Lord Grey of the Freedom of the City of Glasgow.

dangers which threaten our trade averted. But one of the things which has been brought home to us is this, and one of the reasons why our own trade is depressed now is, that other countries are too poor to purchase from us, and you have even in commercial circles to-day, used to looking at the matter purely from the material point of view, the question being raised, how can you help the other countries of Europe with credit, in order that you may enable them to purchase from us. Is that not a little step further forward in making the countries feel, that, even from the commercial point of view, the individual national good cannot be attained without also taking the common good into consideration?

There, again, you have the material motive, the material purpose coming into line with the moral purpose, and as I said that smooths the path. But bear in mind this, that though for the moment acting from the material motive or acting from the moral motive may bring people to the same conclusion, it makes a vast difference from which motive you do act. You are not going to produce the same result by doing the thing simply because you think it pays, that you will produce by doing that same thing from the motive that you think it and believe it to be right. If you are to have a better world, it is essential that the motive from which you act should be a moral motive, based upon your feeling for what is right. If people have come to see that the material interests of other countries coincide so much the better. That smooths the path, but do not lose sight of the fact that it is the motive from which you act which is really in the long run going to settle whether what you are doing is going to be progress or not. And I would say this to any of you who are thinking of going into public life, or indeed whatever you may be doing in life, begin when you are young to be honest with yourself

about your motives. It is not easy. It is comparatively easy to be honest with other people but comparatively difficult to deceive other people, because you get found out! It is very easy to deceive yourself, because you don't find yourself out, and nothing is more difficult than to be quite honest about the motives from which you act. I will give, simply as a little instance, what a difficult job this is. You are asked to go to a public meeting for a purpose which you thoroughly approve and believe to be morally right, and your motive in accepting the invitation is entirely right, but when you come to make your speech you will find it very difficult not to put into your speech something which is put in not entirely because you think it right, but because you think it will contribute to the success of your speech! I give that as a little illustration which runs through everything in life. It is not enough to be assured that you *begin* with an honourable and a moral and a Christian motive. Unless you have the habit and keep the habit from the beginning of trying to be honest with yourself about your motives, you may be quite sure as you get on in life you will lose the power of being honest with yourself, and you will be constantly acting from motives which you would not approve if you stopped to think of them. And thus in life when you come to the question of reform, hatred by itself is never going to do good in the world. I do not mean that you ought not to hate what is wrong or feel indignation when you see wrong, but when hate becomes the dominant motive, and in so far as it is the dominant motive, your action will be destructive and not constructive.

Now what can you do in public life under the Student Christian Movement? At the present time there is really a struggle going on between what is ideal and what is material, which is part of the outcome of the war. You

can see it, as an instance, illustrated in the United States to-day. At this moment you have got a discussion going on in the United States—a discussion most important, because what the United States does is more important for the world at this moment than what any other individual single country does—on the subject of armaments. There is a view put forward there that a great and powerful country should make its armaments the strongest in the world without regard to other considerations. But there is also the view put forward there that the United States ought to take the lead in getting other nations together to prevent competition in the growth of armaments and to restrict the growth of armaments. As an instance of what we call the ideal view I would like to give you this quotation:—

“ Unless some such move ” (that is a move to get the countries together to restrain competition in armaments) “ is made, we may ask ourselves whether civilization does not really reach a point where it begins to destroy itself and whether we are thus doomed to go headlong through a destructive war to darkness and barbarism.”

Now these are powerful words ; putting the case shortly but putting it very strongly. They are words spoken in the United States the other day by General Pershing who was their Commander-in-Chief during the war. Now this is what I mean when I say there is a struggle going on between idealism and materialism, and that you have it exemplified in the United States at this moment. What the outcome will be and what the policy of the United States will be we do not know. We only see that these are ~~these~~ <sup>those</sup> forces at work in the United States, and whether idealism or whether materialism wins in any particular country depends enormously upon the response it gets from other countries.

In conclusion, I would say to you, as the Student

## 12 *The Need and Possibility of a New World*

Christian Movement in this country and in every country which is here represented, watch those signs in different countries of the struggle between idealism and materialism ; bear in mind that your part in your own country is to use all your influence to induce your own country to respond to the ideal side in order that you may strengthen it in other countries, and if you can do that then you will be doing something to help that which I said at the beginning of my speech, was the thing which was essential to make a better world—getting the different countries together. No country can make a better world alone. In the leading countries of the world at this moment, you have a struggle between idealism and materialism showing itself. The question of which will win, which will dominate the policies of the countries, depends enormously in every country on the response which is made from other countries. Now as a Student Christian Movement I think that you have an organization which, in addressing itself to public affairs, may have a most powerful and beneficial influence in promoting that response from one country to another, through the best elements in one country to the best elements of another, which may do something to produce a better world.

## INDIA IN TRANSITION

The Rev. A. G. FRASER, Kandy

INDIA in transition! No subject more vast or so complex could be given to a speaker. India with its population greater than that of all North America, plus South America, plus Australia, plus the whole of mighty Africa, and India in transition!

A falling pebble may have serious consequences, but when a mighty mountain moves, the strongest may well tremble. And mighty India is moving so rapidly that no Westerner in or out of her can keep pace with her rapid changes. All classes and types, of course, are not moving equally. Confined to one address I must deal in generalities, and none of them will be without exception.

In the many kindreds, peoples, and tongues that go to make up India, there is no rule that has not its exception. Perhaps there is one. I have seen social, political, and educational problems in Africa, America, China, the Philippines, and Japan, and in none of them are the problems so great or the means for solving them so small as in India. India seems to have all the difficulties that exist in other lands with special ones of her own such as no other land has, and she has fewer means of meeting them. I cannot pretend to do more than skim the surface of my subject, but I shall try to indicate the need for the reforms to-day, and the attitude of various classes in India towards them. Some have represented the reforms as undesired and undesirable, and have spoken as though they were a

mere emanation from the brain of a single Secretary of State. Sir Michael O'Dwyer, the Carson of India, after making the point that the reforms were demanded by "a small and not quite disinterested minority," whilst the masses were silent, quoted the words of Burke: "Because half a dozen grasshoppers under a fern make the field ring with their importunate cries, whilst thousands of great cattle, who repose beneath the shadow of the British oak, chew their cud and are silent, pray do not imagine that those who make the noise are the only inhabitants of the field."

A far more reliable, because a more sympathetic and less hide-bound, witness is Lord Meston. He points out that nationalism is rapidly growing, and has won all the professional and many of the landed class to its ranks. "It is," he says, "the engrossing occupation of many thousands of intelligent men, and its bounds are enlarging daily." As to the need for popular reforms, he says: "We have been behindhand all the time. Political concessions have lost much of their value by their appearance of having been wrung from us; and in fact, whether deservedly or not, we do not possess the confidence of many of the best public men in India, whilst we have lost valuable chances of appealing to their sense of responsibility." Again, it is the same story as in Ireland. We have been behindhand. We are slow to follow Gladstone's great principle and maxim, "Trust the people."

But is India fit for self-government? Well, is any nation fit for it? Certainly none are till they try, and all have to learn by mistakes self-made. But Arabia, Afghanistan, and Turkey have self-government. Fitness is not the test required in this world, but power to shut others out.

But India's problems are harder than those of these others. Sir Michael Sadler speaking of them says: "Reformers in India know how divided India has been in her

long history, racially, linguistically, socially ; they do not desire to minimize these difficulties, but hope and mean to transcend them. And they desire our sympathy and help to overcome them. Trained by us, led to hope by us, they have a right to our help and co-operation. Few in numbers their influence is very widespread, and rapidly increasing beyond all belief."

Nationalists of all parties appreciate the extraordinary difficulties, but believe they can be tackled, and with good reason they declare that many of them are vanishing before the new intense nationalism, the passionate love of India.

Take, for instance, the common statement that India is a mere congeries of nations. Lord Meston says : " The cliché that India is not a nation but a congeries of nations can no longer comfort the opponents of progress."

Hindus and Mohammedans too in 1916 came to an agreement as to the distribution of seats in the provincial councils. In the main they now offer a united front. From Hardwar to Cape Comorin, when Ghandi speaks to-day men listen. And yet India is not united nor democratic. Mohammedans, non-Brahmins, Indian Christians, Sikhs, Europeans, Anglo-Indians, all sought community representation, and pressed for sectional rather than national interests, fearing to trust themselves into the hands of the majority.

Let me now try to describe some of the attitudes towards the question of the Reforms ; and first that of the Indian Civil Service.

The Civil Service has been for sixty years the real ruler of India, and it has done its work well. How well, the attitude of India towards the war showed. There is no service under the Crown, I doubt if there is one in the world, with a nobler record. The sensation and the first almost universal incredulity that greeted the story of the Punjab misrule is in itself a testimony to the record of

the I.C.S., and all over India there are members of the Service who deeply deplore that stain on the record they are so proud of. Most British officials to-day have no troops to support them, but rule large districts of from one to three million people with merely a small body of civil police, under a British superintendent. They have many anxious moments, and need all the prestige of a strong Government behind them. How far the reforms will affect Government's prestige at first, it is impossible to tell. But there is no doubt that many feel deeply concerned. You cannot, either, have elections without considerable unsettlement. Also, of course, it is a sore thing to become second after having been first, and to serve where you have ruled. And the work which has been so loved and done so efficiently, will it suffer ?

So there are troubled questionings in the minds of many civilians to-day, and the love of India's millions lies behind much of their doubt and hesitation. But Lord Sinha has summed up the situation well. He said the British Government was the best India had had for ages, but good government could not be a substitute for self-government. Every British official in India must consider himself a trustee "bound to make over his charge to the rightful owners the moment the latter attain to years of discretion," and to this most of the civilians would agree.

Then there are the Moderates. They are at present a small minority as against the Extremists, but seem to be gaining in power. They contain in their ranks the leading landholders and men of affairs—the men with "a stake in the country." The greatest statesman whom India has produced in modern times, Mr Gokhale, long led the party, and in administrative capacity I believe they are superior to their opponents. They desire to work the reforms, and to work them with a view to getting further self-government by instalments.

But they wish to see the Government of India transferred from British to Indian hands. Why? Sir Thomas Monro, who died as Governor of Madras in 1827, said: "The strength of the British Government enables it to put down every rebellion, to repel every foreign invasion, and to give to its subjects a degree of protection which those of no native power enjoy. Its laws and institutions also afford them a security from domestic oppression unknown in native states; but these advantages are dearly bought. They are purchased by the sacrifice of independence, of national character, of whatever renders a people respectable. . . . It is from men who either hold or are eligible for public office that nations take their character; where no such men exist, there can be no energy in any other class of the community." Sir Thomas Monro, a hundred years ago, is far ahead in his thinking, of the Council of the European Association to-day, who write of "the problematic future blessing of nationhood" not compensating "the Indian masses for their suffering during the transitional period." Colonel Lawrence, writing of Mesopotamia, says: "It is true we have increased prosperity—but who cares for that when liberty is in the other scale." Listen to Romesh Chandra Dutt, as quoted by Sir Verney Lovett. Describing a night spent at the North Cape with other tourists in 1886, he wrote: "I will not conceal the pain and humiliation which I felt in my inmost soul as I stood on that memorable night among representatives of the free and advancing nations of the earth rejoicing in their national greatness. . . . I felt within me I had no place among them." The great Gokhale, too, speaks of "breathing an atmosphere of inferiority." Our colonies felt the same. Mr Gladstone in 1886 said: "England tried to pass good laws for the colonies, but the colonies said: 'We do not want your good laws, we want our own.' We

admitted the reasonableness of the principle." Mr Bonar Law in the House of Commons in 1917 said: "I think that very often a bad form of Government, if it is with the consent of the people governed, will work infinitely better than a much better system without that consent and goodwill." No man desires to be governed by a machine however perfect, or by a stranger however philanthropic. To deny the right of choice to any race is to deny them manhood, and even growth towards it.

The reforms have been criticized freely as revolutionary proposals, as a bolt from the blue. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill was similarly denounced. It is truer to say with Lord Meston, "We have been behindhand all the time." The national movement in India is a great spiritual force, noble and powerful, for the uplifting of the people, even if some of its manifestations are regrettable. And it inspires not only politics, but lies behind great social efforts and workers, behind musicians and poets, like Rabindra Nath Tagore, the greatest poet of our age, and behind painting as in the Indian Art School at Calcutta. It is a Renaissance, and is stirring into activity the peoples of India, and everywhere it means life.

The Extremists too, desire self-government, but want it at once, or refuse anything but the most rapid instalments. The course of reforms is perilous in any country, as witness China, Russia, or Turkey. But the pathway before them is beset with far greater difficulties in India. Yet the Extremists are generally ready to rush into all difficulties, and meantime many are unrestrained in language and statement. This applies to the English members of the Party also. For instance, Mrs Besant, when an Extremist, characterized the Reforms as "leading to a line beyond which its authors cannot go—a perpetual slavery which can only be broken by revolution."

The worst effect of these statements is that they tend

to destroy such trust and mutual understanding as exist between Government and people, stir up race hatred, and so create an atmosphere which makes the advance of self-government greatly more difficult. Mr Lloyd George said that an atmosphere of nervous suspicion and distrust was the real enemy of Ireland. So it is in India. But, of course, it takes two to make such an atmosphere endure. The Government's desire to save its prestige plays into the hands of its enemies. No one to-day believes that any government can do no wrong, and a frank admission of mistakes and apology for them would often save serious misunderstanding. For instance, the punishments meted out to officers guilty of the Punjab enormities ought to be as widely known as their offences.

The thing which, above all others, has given the Extremists their present power, is not Gandhi only. He is a great moral and spiritual force, the greatest single force in India to-day, though I think he is lacking in political sense. But the Extremists have their power largely as a result of Sir Michael O'Dwyer's government of the Punjab, and the events that followed. It is said that General Dyer saved the Punjab. The Hunter Commission did not think so. But he and others like him made the work of government extraordinarily difficult in every province of British India. What did he do? In his perfectly honest and straightforward evidence before the Hunter Commission, he made it quite clear what he did. Believing that our rule rested on force, he determined to give a lesson in the deadliness of modern weapons which would not be forgotten. To him, as to Caiaphas, it seemed good that one man or more should die for the nation, be it just or unjust, so he shot down hundreds. *The Times of India* said, with its wonted courage, there is not "a single Englishman or Englishwoman who should not feel a sense of irremovable shame both at the tragedy of the Jullian-

wallah Bagh, and at the excesses which were committed in the martial law regions of the Punjab." The diabolical crawling order, the flogging of unconvicted schoolboys, the bombing of peasants in the fields from aeroplanes, these things have rung through India, and never has she been so united or so bitter. Well, General Dyer of the massacre and crawling order, has been retired, and through the *Morning Post* English men and women have given him £20,000. Do you wonder Indians are bitter? Whilst some missionaries protested, others subscribed to the fund, and more have applauded Dyer as having saved their lives and those of Indian Christians by a timely massacre. Well, they are supposedly the servants of Him, Who had as His epitaph, "Others He saved, Himself He could not save." Do you wonder Indians are scornful?

You cannot hold India by terror, or by machine guns. It is a trust, not a conquest. And, despite the militarists, the only kingdom which can last is that based on service. One thing I would like to say, however, is that the Punjab atrocities are not defended on racial grounds. The defenders of them are a ruling caste, who would equally defend massacre in Ireland or in Russia, or against a great strike were it practical politics. You will never hear them defended amongst those who believe in democracy or in the great traditions of freedom.

One of the worst problems before us to-day in India is, none the less, that of race-prejudice. I believe it is worse since the war. The idea of "lesser breeds without the law" appeals strongly to our self-importance. There are no lesser breeds. There are backward races, those that have been out of the main current of progress for some centuries. We used to be of them. Cicero says, "Atticus . . . the stupidest and ugliest slaves come from Britain." India was then far ahead of us. But she has remained largely in the Middle Ages. To-day is her Renaissance,

and she is not going to be amongst the backward races in the near future.

Meantime race-prejudice poisons the atmosphere. Often the blame is thrown on coarse and vulgar exhibitions of it by brutal and ignorant Englishmen, and railway incidents and suchlike are cited. But polished and cultured exhibitions of it are at least as evil, and far commoner. The scorn of the politicians, for instance, in Sir Michael O'Dwyer's quotation from Burke, is more deadly to goodwill and mutual understanding than the brutal act of a half-drunk bully. The one represents the scorn of a governing class and is not strongly condemned by his fellows. The other is the act of a hooligan, which all races and classes keep, but are heartily ashamed of. It is the class type of scorn or patronage which, for instance, has made the word "native" offensive, and whenever possible the use of it is now to be avoided. It is this common patronage that is the serious thing. And it shows itself more in relation to educated Indians, who claim equality with us, than to rajahs on the one hand or to ryots on the other. But it is found less, I believe, amongst the better civil servants than amongst any other class, including missionaries: they know their India, and appreciate Indians as few outside their ranks do. The treatment of Indians in South Africa has of course increased ill-feeling. Race-prejudice and race-pride slew the Christ and hounded Paul to death. They justified, even glorified, the slave trade. They made 1914 and all the horrors that followed it. They are worse than drink or lust and just as much a part of our nature as these sins are, and the nation or empire that nourishes or even tolerates them shall surely die.

Some of the difficulties that will face Indian ministers should be indicated. There is the vast illiteracy together with the grinding poverty which makes the provision

of education very difficult. The teachers are almost in destitution in the villages, and such poverty is a poor soil for anything but Bolshevism. There are the outcaste masses, frequently in an economic and social degradation which cannot be paralleled even in Africa. In many places there is strong opposition to their being educated, and in spite of Government rules they are often excluded from village schools. Yet the greatest economic wealth of a nation is not in its land, or trade, or mines, but in its people. And the poverty of India is due, not, as is often said by Indian politicians, to a foreign Government's presence, but to the presence of a large and unjustly degraded mass who cannot produce their own food or anything like it. I do not consider the outcastes are an argument against the reforms. We have yet to see that their condition can be made much worse. Our Government has done what it can for them, but it is little a Government can do in advance of public opinion, and as foreigners we cannot at present influence that strongly. Indian ministers should be able to do much more in that way, and some of them have the welfare of the masses on their hearts.

The social evils of India are also a great difficulty in the way of political advance. The seclusion of women, premature marriage, and other evils weaken the race. Caste hinders economic progress in limiting the free movement and adaptation of labour to present needs. Again there is little idea of investments. In the four years ending 1919, 1,200,000,000 rupees were withdrawn from circulation to be hoarded, out of use and India in poverty.

Again, there is the pessimism of Indian thought. We are born, grow, decay, and die and the process goes on and on, round and round. Politically the great thing Jesus gave to the Roman and Greek world was the forward

look—Hope. He pointed us to a Kingdom yet to come, a better day. There the Indian politician will have a hard time for many a day for Hope has come to the few only. With the forward look history becomes an ordered process with a rational thought behind it. Without hope it becomes a mere series of incidents. India needs the God of Hope.

And now I come to the missionary and his relation to these questions. Many say we should take no part in politics. No one says so when our help is desired. But the majority of missionaries cannot afford the books or papers which alone can keep them in touch with Indian affairs. I should think I am safe in saying that 90 per cent. do not get papers edited by Indians. But you cannot know a people and its thoughts unless you read its press. Which of you living in France would be satisfied to see its mind through the Paris edition of *The Daily Mail*?

E.G.  
Hoy  
at Port

A large number of missionaries are working amongst outcastes, and to them this seething modern India seems far away. Again, in many of our colleges the classes are so large and the missionaries are so few that personal contact between teacher and taught is, from the point of view of numbers, as difficult as in the Scottish Universities, added to which you have the differences of race, environment, and language.

So on the whole the missionary body is out of touch with Indian aspirations, and very conservative. Undeserved denunciations of Government have driven them in fairness to side with those attacked. Fear for the depressed classes, again, makes them against self-government. Their intellectual isolation above all keeps them aloof. And so Indians have, as a whole, very little say in the management of Indian Church life. Of course there are exceptions to this, the most striking being that of Tinnevely.

To illustrate what I mean let me take the missionary attitude to the conscience clause. Rightly or wrongly, to Indian leaders the conscience clause is the badge of freedom in education. All free countries, they say, have it. Most missionaries would grant the need of a conscience clause in single school areas. But that the conscience clause is a matter of principle, and that it should be adopted wherever public monies are taken most would deny. In this country we insist on the right of a parent to refuse to have a child taught a religion contrary to his own belief. Surely the parent should be more considered in India where he has no vote and where our missionaries are foreigners.

But again the whole conception of the compulsory teaching of the faith of Jesus Christ is wrong. The Roman Church has too much sense to do it. So long as there is no feeling against it and the atmosphere is purely friendly, no harm need be done. But so soon as compulsion is necessary to secure attendance, so soon is the situation harmful. We tend to believe the religion of Christ can be taught. It cannot : it must be caught. The Christian faith is not a religion in the sense often used, not a dogma but a friendship. And because we send out few teachers to large classes, and make personal influence difficult, we put our hope in the cheaper compulsory religious instruction. In one instance recently where students struck against it, the ringleaders were excluded. Under such circumstances the teaching is apt to turn out skilled enemies of the faith taught, but not caught. The keenest anti-Christian propagandist I know in India to-day was thus taught in a missionary institution. The whole thing is against the winsomeness of Christ, and I say this though most of my missionary life I have been ready to accept it and not seen the evil of it.

There is much too much of the ruler and of the teacher

about us all. Christ sent us to grow like Himself in wisdom and to learn of the land to which He came. And neither for a Christian man or nation is there any call but that to serve. The standard set by Christ to a man applies, too, to the Christian nation or empire. He gave His great invitation to the individual, "Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of Me, for I am gentle and humble in heart and ye shall find rest unto your souls." He gave His invitation to the nation when He came offering Himself as King, not on a war-horse, with force or display, but "gentle and mounted on an ass and on a colt the foal of a beast of burden." On that day He claimed kingship on the ground of lowly service. But the nation desired a leader against the foe, and they weighed Him in their balances, and found Him wanting. "He came unto His own and His own received Him not." Now we know how terrible was their mistake. They crucified their glory, the Lord of Glory. Had they accepted Him the Romans would have crucified Him, but, instead of a handful, a nation would have been spread abroad to tell His deathless story and to found the Kingdom firm based on service not rule, on responsibility not privilege, and long ere now His Kingdom would have stretched from shore to shore, fightings and bitterness would have passed away, and the nations would be walking in the light of the Lamb. Only as a nation and an empire are based on the principles and live in the Spirit of Him, only so shall their dominion be an everlasting dominion and their kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

If you are looking for a life of service where it is hard and possibly dangerous, but where it is greatly needed, if you wish for a chance of following the Incarnate, of emptying yourself to learn anew: if you seek to work

where every power you have will be used to the full and more will be demanded of you ; if you desire to share in the passion of redeeming love, then there is no field in all God's rich creation, nobler and needier than India. But her need is for servants and fellow-labourers, and her call is in the Name of Him Who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many.

## THE CHALLENGE OF CHINA

The Rev. NELSON BITTON, London Missionary Society

THE China of 800 B.C. in all essential characteristics is living to-day and virile. That fact alone should compel a reverent admiration for her people and for their character. Unworthy nations do not live through millenniums, they die and are forgotten or leave but the memory of a bygone glory. There should be no room in the mind of any student worthy of the name, for a cheap sneer or an easy contempt when China is named. The attitude called for is that of the great Dr Legge who, when ascending the Altar of Heaven at Peking, took his shoes from off his feet, esteeming the place "holy ground." Nor should there be any place in any Christian mind for the unmistakable "gaucherie" that plucks amusement out of the social customs of an ancient people because they differ from our own. The tendency of the modern playwright to ascribe subtle villainy and diabolic cruelty to their Chinese characters is an evidence of thoroughly bad taste as well as a hindrance to brotherhood. China is not only entitled to, but *is really worthy of* the unfeigned respect of the world. That she leads the world no longer does not rob her of the fact that she has in forgotten days led mankind in ethics, education, culture, invention, and art. Europe is now re-discovering the extent of her obligation to the Chinese through the developing years of Western civilization and with that discovery should come respect.

We may be grateful to Mr H. G. Wells for drawing our

attention to the persistent neglect of the world influence of Asia by the professional historians. The Western educated world has laughed much at the old universal geography of China, with China as the Middle Kingdom in the midst of the four seas, and the rest of the world dots on the unknown ocean. But Europe has taught and written most of its universal history in a similar fashion. The great names of Chinese history are worthy of their place in the foremost rank of the world's leaders. In the story of conquest by peaceful penetration no people has ever accomplished so much or so successfully as the Chinese. By trade, by diplomacy, and particularly by culture, the Chinese have widened the borders of Empire through the ages far more than by force of arms. At least three times in their national history the Chinese have been overcome by the might of invading barbarian armies, and in the end by patient pursuance of established national ideals of social life and culture have overcome by incorporation the life of the conqueror. China is the one country in the world in which even the Jews have lost their racial identity and have been absorbed.

Not that China is ignorant of the power of the sword. It is too little remembered that the might of Genghis Khan established an Empire which held nations in fealty from Korea to the shores of the Caspian Sea. As soldiers the Chinese are not to be despised. The Chinese Labour battalion in France had no unworthy record. It is from intellectual and moral conviction and not from cowardice that the Chinese seek peace. It remains true that the glory of China's age-long life is its exaltation of the civil power and art of a nation and its characteristic disparagement of mere militarism. The Chinese social order is expressed thus: (1) Scholars, (2) Farmers, (3) Artizans, (4) Traders. That a nation with such corporate ideals is to-day the oldest living nation of mankind provides surely

a lesson for statesmanship in all lands which may not be ignored. "They that live by the sword, perish by the sword," is one of the great lessons of universal history and may not be forgotten in our day without disaster.

Nor to-day does the Chinese nation desire to change its ideals. H. E. Alfred Sze<sup>1</sup> says:—

"Fortunately for the peace and security of the world the peaceful development of China and her millions is an absolute certainty unless, indeed, that development is deflected by foreign agency into channels of militarism. The *Chinese* development of China, if I may put it that way, must make for peace if only because the whole of Chinese culture rests on the power and appeal of moral force. The entire body of Confucian teaching centres around that conception. We hold material force so meanly that the soldier is the lowest member in our social hierarchy. And this Chinese valuation of the fighting man will remain unchanged as long as the Chinese people are allowed to progress and develop along the lines of their own national characteristics."

The exaltation of intellect carried, it is true, to unwise excess, is another of the supreme characteristics of China's gift to the world. The greatest names of her history are not those of armed conquerors, but of heroes of thought and prophets of conduct. Confucius, Mencius, Wen Wang, Chu-hsi, of old, Chang Chi Tung, Kang Yu-wei, Liang Chi-chou in modern days, are the names of might and merit. In the face of this aspect of China's life what room is there left for any attitude of superiority or expression of contempt, unless we measure men and things by the material standards of might and possession and reveal our own lack of true idealism thereby. In any fair comparison of history we find much we have to learn from a nation which, in spite of lack of progressive thought and in the face of

<sup>1</sup> Formerly Chinese minister to Great Britain.

much perverted idealism has never lowered those standards of national life which make for peace and permanence.

It was through the discipline of learning that the character of the "Superior man" was refined. The knowledge of principles gained thereby was all-embracing. For the sake of scholarship men have gone hungry and cold, and have been revered though ragged, and renowned though poor. Of course it was ridiculous to suppose that proficiency in classical literature equipped a man for the building of a city wall or the repairing of an embankment! But it has yet to be proved that a knowledge of mechanics is a better equipment for ruling than an understanding of history, or that government by technicians is superior to that of classical scholars.

The persistence of this worthy social and moral ideal is all the more remarkable when it is remembered that it has not had any large backing from religion. The semi-deification of heroes and sages, and their worship, and that of ancestors has provided the static religious expression common to all China, fixing social and moral standards along lines of normal average human conduct, and yet at the same time limiting progress by the inadequate nature of its ideals. In China religion has never been competent to the social ideal or to steady progress. Neither Confucianism, Buddhism, nor Taoism has any sufficient word for the life of China to-day. Their results have been more negative than positive, and their influence preventive rather than progressive. Recent developments in China show the absolute need of the nation for a progressive faith which can stand firm before the assaults of modern civilization and point the way to a fuller life. This need is confessed openly by the leaders of the nation and expressed by the multitudes of the people in the commotions of the land. The unsatisfied heart of China seeks rest and does not find it yet. It is at this point and in such circum-

stances that Christ stands with His message of soul-power for China's acknowledged need.

No land has been more profoundly disturbed by the onrush of modern civilization to an unprepared people than has China, and in every estimate of the present moral, as well as political, life of the nation this great factor must be borne in mind. In less than one generation China has passed from the candle to the electric age, and there are instances in Chinese cities where, without the intermediary stages, social life has passed directly from the standards of a thousand years ago to the modern age of electricity. Great expectations, many of them impossible of fulfilment, have filled the mind of the younger and better educated section of Chinese people, whilst the common folk have been lost in a confused medley of apprehension, hope, and hatred. Behind the tragedy which marks the life of China to-day, particularly in the collapse of her old political and moral standards of life, the impact of Western and such materialistic civilization stands as the greatest contributing cause. It is little wonder that in the face of the vast steamships navigating the Yangtse, the foreign men-of-war that are continually sailing off her coasts, the aeroplanes that now speed over incredibly ancient city walls, and the undreamt-of power-machinery which is driving the new mills of China, so full of menace as well as of promise to the life of the common people, the great figures of the past with their moral teaching and their reverence for the far-distant culture of China's legendary days seem faint and ineffective. Time must be given, patience must be exercised, sympathy must be freely offered, and practical help along the lines of service which have proved most effective for the safeguarding of our own moral and spiritual welfare must be freely offered to China to repair the ravages which our own civilization has made in the great body of Chinese life. A direct and

vast responsibility lies upon Western lands to-day and a great obligation must be faced and met.

It must not be supposed that China will unquestioningly swallow whatever medicine the West may offer in the name of remedial help. Out of her own long past China has learned to judge things on the merits of their accomplishment and is not inclined to accept theories which do not ally themselves with accomplished facts. The practical test is that which the average Chinese immediately applies to every proposition which may be set before him. He is the world's outstanding realist. "By their fruits ye shall know them" is even remorselessly applied by the Chinese to every professor of doctrines, old or new. This is one of the reasons why the service of medicine more than any other has been so successful in commending the religion of Jesus Christ to the Chinese people. The goodwill and philanthropy which have as their one and only adequate explanation a definite compulsion to serve, carry unfailing conviction to the Chinese mind.

Nor does China refrain from a comparison of our Western accomplishments with our professed ideals. The selfish political propaganda of Western lands in search of territory and spheres of influence has not furthered the missionary enterprise of the Christian Church. It is in spite of the effect of the Versailles decisions regarding Shan-tung that China listens to the teaching of Christ. Every moral failure of the West reacts in Asia. It is useless for us to carry to China a Gospel in the power of which we have lost hope at home. If Christ fails to save in Europe it is folly to believe that He will prove effective in the Far East. Our Gospel is missionary because it is "the power of God unto salvation *to every one* who believes." It finally lives in a demonstration of power. For people to turn in despair from a failing Church at home to the

expectation of a living Church abroad is, in view of the nature of the Christian message, a futile act. The Gospel which *works everywhere* convinces men; and China, more than any land, enquires what Christ has done and is doing in Europe and America, and concludes accordingly.

The standards of our life and the zeal of the Church at home are a vital part of the whole missionary campaign. Every honest missionary knows this to be the case. That is why the scandals of our national life in Europe hold back the coming of the Kingdom in Asia. Opium in China was more deadly to Christ than even to the Chinese. Morphine (and let Scotland realize its responsibility) by its reflex influence damages the Holy Spirit of God even beyond the myriad bodies it scars and destroys. The most potent obstacles to Christian effort in China are made, not in Asia, but in the West.

On the other hand, every effort in the name of Christ for freedom from ancient ills, for the overthrow of contemporary vice, or for the relief of the suffering and the oppressed, and for the uplifting of the moral standards of the people, becomes a convincing apologetic to the Chinese mind. By its amazing combination of intellectual ability and practical attainment the Chinese character presents to-day a medium for world service which, if enlisted "on the side of the angels," will do much to safeguard the ethical life of the world that is to be. For this reason the entrance of Christian men into the realm of Chinese public life is an omen of good not for China only, but for mankind. Recognition by non-Christian men in China of the place and value of Christian ideals in the education of the youth of their land, such as is forthcoming to-day on every side, brings, too, its assurance of coming good. China's moral conscience, persistent through the ages, subject to periods of uplift and depression, but never forgotten or withdrawn.

is awaiting the touch of Christ to transform it into one of the outstanding moral agencies of the world.

The vast student life of China to-day with great Christian representatives such as David Yui, C. T. Wong, Ding Li Mee, and many another known and honoured amongst us, stands now at the parting of [the ways. Partisan passion evoked as the tool of self-seeking and shortsighted politicians : material interests urged upon the attention of the young life of China by the power of the purse which marks much of Chinese life : military ambition beckoning the mind along the road of world conquest : and the lowly service of man inspired by the life and message of Jesus, are contending for the suffrages and loyalties of young China. These things are surely a challenge on a world scale to the men and women who believe in Christ.

There is no need to appeal to sentiment or pity to promote the service of the Christian youth of our land in the interests of China. Not that there is no cause for pity—vast social need, terrific political injustice, the hopeless lot of the vast submerged as well as great tragedies of human woe such as the present famine, all call for the pity of men. But other lands can present their pictures of heart-breaking need—Europe also—and the challenging word in China is not pity but *respect*, and the instinct which is effective and surviving is not sentiment but *brotherhood*. Here is “the brother for whose sake the Lord Christ died.” For there is no nation more worthy of all that Christ and His Church can offer than China : no people more ready to respond to the challenge of the central life of Jesus than the heirs of the teaching of Confucius and Mencius and their peers. Great reserves of strength, as untapped to-day as the great mineral resources of the land, are awaiting discovery and development. Mr Reinsch, the U.S. Minister in Peking states :—

"The twentieth century will be China's century, just as the outstanding feature of the nineteenth century was the unprecedented development of America." A patience greater than the West has ever shown, persistence more dogged than any other country possesses, and an ability to apply the result of thought and motive to actual life which the West is losing, are amongst the great gifts which China has to offer to the Kingdom of God on earth. They who serve this land and people serve the coming day, and they who offer their lives upon this glorious altar of service are sowing the seeds of a harvest that will enrich the lives of men and affect the destinies of coming peoples.

There may be some here feeling that this picture of China's need and possibility is partisan. What of the great national evils of China?—gambling, concubinage, speculation, gross misgovernment, idolatry and superstitions; what about civil war? Are there not these things?

Yes, there are; but I have refrained from bringing them into the picture because, for one thing, it does not seem fitting in an assembly such as this to take a lower standard than that of the great Confucius who, when asked for a message which could govern the relationships of men, replied:—"Is not *reciprocity* such a word," and who developed his reply into the negative form of the "Golden rule"—*Do not unto others what you would not they should do unto you*. Let him that is without sin among the nations cast the first stone at China. For Christ said, *Whatsoever therefore ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also unto them*.

There is more behind my restraint, however, than even this. No *evangel* was ever carried forward on a programme of denunciation and destructive criticism. Christ came "*not to condemn the world*." It was not "because God so *hated the wickedness* of the world," but—this is the word—"God so *loved the world* that He gave."

And if I have made you see the Chinaman that God loves and the China that He sent His Son to save, I have done my part.

Then a vision might come upon us, like the light that flashed upon Masfield's Saul Kane in the moment of his conversion, and we might cry with him—

“I know that Christ has given me birth,  
To brother all the souls of earth,”

and we should be constrained to go forth under the impulse of that vision to minister to the sons of men.

## AFRICA AND THE AFRICANS

The Rev. DONALD FRASER, Livingstonia

TO-DAY Europe is controlling Africa. No definite policy led her there, and no single motive. If the New Jerusalem has twelve gates by which the nations of the earth may enter, not less varied have been the impulses that flung Europe into Africa. She has not marched in deliberately, she has tumbled in, sometimes landing on her feet, as often falling prone.

Commerce has sometimes been her guide, eager for rapid wealth, or new markets for her home productions. Too often commerce has worn a religious grin, saying in the mystic language of the past she would "Plant the cross on every headland," and in the blunt language of to-day, she would teach the natives "The dignity of labour." But honestly and plainly, she wished to make her pockets bulge.

Empire has forced Europe in, to defend her trade routes, to preserve her Hinterland, to guard her frontiers. And let us remember that Philanthropy too has compelled her to action. Then she became the unwilling servant of clamorous public opinion which called her to heal open sores, to save helpless people from menacing danger. By whatever gate Europe entered, she is there, and can only justify herself in so far as she fulfils her trusteeship for Africa.

I like to trace the hand of God in history. It is easier to so do when the gathering years give us long vistas, and

we see how God is working His purposes out. In the story of Africa you can see God's protecting hand over this helpless child of His. There was a time when national conscience was not roused as it is to-day to recognize in some measure, that men must carry Christian principles with them, in trade and empire. Then the interior was closed by ignorance and dread. But where we touched the Continent we defiled it. There we found the slave-trade, we flooded the land with fire-arms, we besotted it with rum. What we touched we cursed, but God protected His Continent by closing it. Then came the Evangelical Revival and the agitation of Wilberforce and his company. By the time that men were beginning to recognize the sacredness of human personality in whatever skin he may be clothed, there came the era of the great explorers, led by David Livingstone, a citizen of this neighbourhood; and the interior was revealed, a Continent not barren but rich in land and people. After this came the sudden scramble for Africa, followed by the Berlin and Brussels Treaties, which preserved the people whom Europe was to administer from some of the evils which were ruining the old colonies, from slavery, from fire-arms, from ardent spirits. And the contracting nations undertook to give free opportunity to education and to religious worship. The great war has caused another shuffling of responsibility in Africa, and large tracts of the Continent have changed hands. But national conscience has been awakened still further, and not only are the old evils banned and religious liberty guaranteed, but the mandates declare that "the well-being and development of these peoples is a sacred trust of civilization."

Now we must not rest until this clause is the guiding principle of all the old colonies which Europe administers, as well as of the mandated territories. Everything depends

on how we fulfil the trusts that, through various causes, have come into our hands. Unfaithfulness, greed, and harshness have destroyed both native peoples and their trustees. Where are now the Incas of America with their mighty history and wonderful civilization? What are Spain and Portugal to-day?

Now what is this trust that Europe has to fulfil for Africa? There is first a great political service, for Africa needed and still needs Europe. When the Western world entered the interior, they found there the slave-trade, tribal war, brutal customs. These have all in part been suppressed.

Yet that is only the beginnings of primitive administration. These native people have still to be led along a long road. They are not in our hands to be kept for ever in tutelage. With every gift of education we bring to them, we are raising their self-consciousness and teaching them to aspire to greater responsibility. The day must come when they will have a great voice in the government of their own land. These taxes which they pay must be spent for their good. Laws which we have imposed in the interests of Europeans must be removed, and equal rights for free development of blacks as well as whites will be demanded.

Europe has a great social service to give. For Africa is the most backward of all the Continents. There were tribes still in the hunting stage of civilization, without houses or fields; others in the pastoral stage, nomadic, warlike, with little cultivation, unaccustomed to work. Even the agricultural people have but recently reached this stage, and were wasteful and primitive in their method. Now it is not possible that a people should remain any longer unprogressive. Expanding civilization cannot tolerate their presence. Indolence seems to deny to men their right to live. Lack of discipline menaces the

prosperity of others. When the world is hungry, land cannot lie unproductive, when others are ready to make it fertile. The isolation that once allowed men to live their own lives is broken for ever, and the whole world is a neighbourhood. Against this sleepy Continent Western life has come into sharp collision.

There are two attitudes which seem largely to determine the action of the Western world. One is pure selfishness, the other is impatience. Too many voices are heard which would make Africans for ever the servants of the Europeans. They must always be hewers of wood and drawers of water. There is an irritating cry in the Press and legislative assemblies to make "colonies a white man's land." What does that imply but giving unequal opportunity to the white man, unjust legislation, the crystallizing of colour distinctions? In South Africa some trade unions would forbid the coloured man to touch skilled labour. The hard manual labour is despised by whites and blacks alike; the white man avoids those manual services which lead to skilled labour, and the skilled artisan has still to be recruited from Europe.

Yet the cry is that the black man must learn the dignity of labour. How can you teach him to love labour if you close all avenues to intelligent and remunerative work? Man is the greatest asset of Africa. You maintain a poverty unless you increase the value of man, and make him a more productive member of society.

The impatient policy to which some colonies have yielded introduces forced labour. No method is better fitted to make men hate work, to degrade self-respect, and to hinder the true development of a people.

The same policy of selfishness and impatience may be found in land. Great tracts of land once the possession of natives have been sold to Europeans. Scores of thousands of natives have been removed from their ancestral to new

reserves, that the European may use the richer land. How little attempt is made to better African farming ! While large sums of money are spent on encouraging farming and stock rearing of Europeans, what colony in Africa has definitely spent money on agricultural training for natives in teaching them better science of stock raising ?

Yet we are in Africa as trustees for the peoples of Africa. Government and commerce alike have to recognize the equal rights of all. Black and white are human personalities who deserve and must demand equal justice and equal opportunity for free development.

What has colour to do with distinctions of human personality ? Yet it penetrates into every sphere of life. There are colonies where a coloured man cannot hold land, where a coloured man cannot travel along with a European, cannot walk on the same pavement, cannot sleep in the same hotel, and, with shame be it said, cannot enter the same church, or sit at the same table of the Lord. Here lies the greatest barrier to African progress. Here lies the greatest menace to the peaceable development of the peoples—the colour prejudice that isolates one class from another. Here lies the biggest social contribution that the Church of Christ has to make to Africa—to overcome all colour prejudice, and grant to every man an equal opportunity on his own worth.

I pass from the political and economic service that Europe must give to Africa. There is a greater service far than anything material. It is the gift of thought and character. That is the greatest and most potential gift. You may give to the African full manhood franchise, but if he has not character to use it you put into his hands a curse. You may offer to him avenues of material prosperity, but he cannot walk there until he has intelligence. His most promising beginnings will only end in deteriora

tion and a tangle unless he has character and knowledge to develop them.

Here is the basis of all progress—the only guarantee for the future. This is the peculiar service which missions are making all the time. Yet they must not serve alone. With them Government and trade must co-operate. I do not mean that they should use their forces to compel or tempt religious life or character. St Francis Xavier, in his zeal, recommended to King John that any Indian governor who did not report well of the progress of Christianity in his dominions, or who did not prove himself a useful evangelist, should be cast into prison and his goods confiscated.

Those were heroic measures which would fill our prisons with governors, and produce a queer type of Christianity. Yet it is the duty of governors to care for the best interests of their people. For their care is for man, as well as for lands and minerals, and man cannot be nurtured to a richer and healthier life if thought and character are ignored. Every white man who comes into Africa has become an educator of the people. Lord Bryce has well said that as soon as black man meets white, his education has begun. Government can pursue a policy of broad education, not simply on literary lines, but over a wider field which will produce a better citizen, more progressive and more stable. Traders can refuse to touch any commodity which is harmful, and refuse to make profit out of the loss and damnation of others. They can conduct their business so that everyday they are helping to create a better Africa. I know traders who have developed native industries and cultivation, and at the same time have increased their own prosperity. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that other lessons are being taught. Who have introduced professional prostitution, trade in rum and spirits? Who have roused

bitter class feelings, hatred of the white man, smouldering resentment against petty and great injustices? How many wars have been caused by oppressions, by ignorance of native prejudice, by unjust legislation? What bitterness has come into many an African's heart by our misrepresentation of Christ to Africa?

We must not advance further with disloyalty and mutiny in our ranks. It will not do that government should be in one camp, trade in another, and missions in yet another. Each must be loyal to the other, because all are true to the principles of the Kingdom of God. It is not the monopoly of missions to serve Africa. It is the opportunity of every interest that comes there.

By all ye think and whisper  
By all ye say and do,  
Your new-caught savage peoples  
Shall judge your God and you.

Now let us try to understand what are the thoughts of Africa on which we have to work.

The African is not an idolater but an Animist. His religion centres round the worship of the spirits. There is first the dim idea of the great Creator spirit—an absentee God, unknown, unworshipped, who has nothing to do with this world now. Then there is the great tribal spirit, a hill or sea or river spirit to whom the tribe gives service in great national need. There are the clan spirits who live in pools, or hideous groves. And last there are the ancestral family spirits. They are everywhere. When the dead have gone the living seek by every means to conciliate them. Offerings are placed by the grave or in the house to appease them. They come in diseases or in the form of snakes or wild beasts. If they are friendly all is well. But if they have not revealed themselves, day and night they are everywhere, malevolent, thwarting.

Now in all this worship there is no thought of char-

acter or conduct. The spirits give no help to make people better, they have no comfort for the broken-hearted, no help for the tempted, no gift of knowledge or life.

With so helpless a creed how does Africa not go to pieces, rotting with vile practices? There are other safeguards. One is racial loyalty. Sin is an offence against society; theft, murder, adultery are sins, they hit at the unity of the community, and the sinner is punished by being driven forth. Magic is the other policeman who guards society. Offences bring disease and trouble. When a village or great man is smitten, the witch-doctor seeks the sinner whose sin has brought calamity on others. This garden without a fence is perfectly protected by the magic bundle which hangs from a branch. Nothing could risk to test its power.

In all this I find no power to refine manners, to stimulate progress, to create philanthropy and service. Wild passions; the horrors of Juju worship; murder of twins; neglect of the old; deeds of blood in war and in private revenge; indolence; drunkenness; sensuality; cruelty; lying; selfishness; all the unlovely and hideous passions of men run wild. For all this we bring a message with a reach that covers all human life—character, social relations, national life—and with a power which creates forces which transform all human life.

Our message transforms national life. I have seen it turn the current of a wild warrior race from marauding to peace, from drunken indolence to sober industry. I have sat through a great *indaba* amidst thousands of warriors with their chiefs, and seen them enter peaceably into the ordered government of Britain without the firing of a shot, without presence of a soldier. And at the end the governor acknowledged that this signal annexation was wholly due to the service of missions. Our message transforms social life. It has led tribes into better methods

of agriculture. It has introduced to Africa most of her best plants and fruits. Cotton, coffee, tea, perhaps even maize and cassava are the gifts of missions. It has led men to leave filthy hovels, insanitary stockades, temporary sheds, and build sanitary and neat houses. It has combated disease, saved men from barbarous treatment. It has overthrown human sacrifice, arrested cannibalism, cared for the children, broken the back of slavery.

In old Calabar there lived a priest of one of those dark and terrible Juju groves into which men entered never to return. To him the gospel message came. He became an elder of the Church. And these hands that once were red with the blood of human sacrifices, handed the cup of the Lord to communicants at the Holy Communion. When he died, he asked that on his gravestone there should be inscribed, "Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell."

It has created character and led men into the wonderful fellowship of Christ. What manner of men may they not be who walk with God. Drunken, violent, superstitious women have become refined and gentle. Men who passed through a bog of cruelty and sensuality have become friends of purity and self-sacrifice.

To create these transformations, we have a message of a God who loves and seeks the lost, who at infinite cost to Himself redeemed them, and follows them until they come to Him. Our message is not an isolated and temporary one. We are educators, kindling lights of knowledge which are growing into brighter flame. We are giving to them a priceless teacher and guide in the Word of God in their own tongues. We are establishing a Church which shall be the greatest redeeming institution in Africa, African in character and outlook, and served by the children of Africa.

That land is far away. Its people have manners

and customs different from yours. Their skins are black. Their tongue is strange. You scarcely recognize that they are brothers, sons of one Father, remembered on the Cross for their redemption. What responsibility is there for them in you?

A Tonga was bathing in the lake when a crocodile seized him by the hips, and instead of diving with him, it swam along the surface of the water carrying him. He saw some other men standing by a canoe and he shouted, "I am still alive, save me." They peered out and scanned him. Then they drew up their canoe and went away. He was not of their kin. What did it matter?

Africa, you say, is not of your kin. Its tongue, customs, and colour are different. What does it matter? What does it matter? Everything for you, for Africa, and for Christ! Everything!

# IS CHRISTENDOM FIT FOR A WORLD TASK ?

## (1) THE INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM

KENNETH MACLENNAN

CHRISTENDOM claims to have a world task—to give to mankind a sure basis for all life, individual, national, international, and racial. That is a big claim and at once raises the question whether Christendom is fit for such a task.

A gathering like this cannot help asking that question, for on your shoulders the biggest burden of the centuries is being laid—to deliver this distracted world from its present pain and anarchy and chaos.

We cannot any longer conceive of the expansion of Christendom as the work of a few “professional Christians,” either here or in the mission field. The real impacts of Christendom in our day are made by our industrial, commercial, and political intercourse with the peoples of the world, and, in so far as that intercourse is not effecting a Christian influence, our missionary work is to that extent hindered and handicapped.

It is right, therefore, that our programme should call us this afternoon to consider our industrial system as it affects our fitness for a great spiritual enterprise.

I am postulating the supreme reality of God ; that He has revealed Himself in Jesus Christ ; that it is inherent in that revelation that all the sons of men are

called to be sons of God, and that the task of the Church is to give Him to the world. Assuming all that, we shall plunge at once into our inquiry.

Any definition of our industrial system must be very general and inadequate. Industry, commerce, and finance are all closely bound up together. We cannot, however, in a short afternoon range over a wide area, and although there are dangers in generalization we can only generalize.

A century of unparalleled invention and improved processes covering the whole range of industry, first in textiles, then in iron and steel, combined with the development of steam-power, the introduction of machine tools, the railway, the steamboat, and the electric telegraph brought about that rapid and general expansion which we call the industrial revolution, for it was nothing less than a revolution, if not in speed, certainly in far-reaching consequences.

We have only time to look briefly at one or two of the main features of this enormous development.

1. The massing of capital.
2. The massing of population.
3. The struggle between labour and capital, and
4. Some national and international aspects of the system.

Now we are considering a condition of society, and I want to emphasize at the outset that no good is to be gained by slanging either capitalist or worker. The great bulk of both groups are most excellent men, carrying burdens and faced with the solution of problems from which we might well shrink. In so far as there is evil in the industrial system both are equally its victims and in both groups you will find the best men are worrying tremendously over a way out. Do not think that all captains of industry are villains, or all labour leaders

anarchists, that a man cannot be a good Christian in business. There are conspicuous examples to the contrary, men who are in dead earnest in seeking to do the right thing for the common good, and choice of action is often terribly perplexing.

1. The massing of capital is the greatest feature of the modern industrial system. In early centuries, apart from land, revenue was comparatively small, but the industrial revolution has changed all that. "Capital," says a distinguished professor of economics, "now plays a vitally important part in economic life. Its amount has become vastly greater and its effects larger in modern times." "We live," he says, "in a capitalistic era," "in a condition of affairs dominated by the existence of capital." Money has undoubtedly become the greatest power in the whole world.

Buckle says, "Wealth is an undoubted source of power, and an inquiry into the distribution of wealth is an inquiry into the distribution of power." This wealth is vested in a small class, and, as Buckle adds, "There is no instance on record of any class possessing power without abusing it."

The operation of the power of capital works out in various ways.

There is, in the first place, its tyranny over its owner. It demands good balance-sheets, ever increasing and ever cheaper production and ever wider markets. To secure these things other interests must be disregarded. They may have to be opposed and destroyed. Competitors must be beaten, perhaps eliminated. Other concerns are sorted out into allies, neutrals, and opponents. Raw materials, production, demand, markets, exports, prices must be influenced and controlled. The rules of the game require that everything that helps to these ends must be done. All that hinders must be overcome. The machine

has seized the man with a relentless grip and whirls him along remorselessly at a speed and in directions dictated solely by its own requirements. The man is not a free spirit, but a bondman. No one needs our sympathy more than a captain of industry in these days faced with these things, and desiring to do his duty to his business, his competitor, his workers, and to the community.

Then there is a constant tendency to combine and mass capital against the producer, the consumer, and the competitor, and so we have Amalgamations, Trusts, and Rings. Such combinations have always been regarded with suspicion. There is general agreement among all writers on capital that exploitation by massed capital is inevitable. Combination takes various forms. There is only time for one or two illustrations.

(i) Price associations "to steady prices, exploit a rising market, and effectively resist a declining market." These usually enforce their will by big rebates to all traders who agree to sell only at fixed prices, and by severe boycott of those who will not.

(ii) Associations to secure control of output, hence the pool, each firm paying in a fixed percentage of profit, and sharing in the pool according to allocation of output. An up-to-date illustration is rubber. Rubber companies think that rubber is too cheap because it is too plentiful, so they propose to restrict output in order that prices may rise.

(iii) Combines to eliminate competition. A well-known form is the shipping conference, which gives the option of shipping with the conference only or the loss of certain big rebates and the risk of loss of tonnage. The South African shipping ring, which was broken in 1912 by the Government refusing mail contracts, was an interesting example of this kind of combination against the public interest.

(iv) Then you have big combines to dominate an industry, *e.g.*, steel, soap, sewing-cotton, wall-paper, cement, etc.

Such combinations sometimes serve the public good, but as a rule they are designed to operate primarily in favour of one class and prejudicially against others, whether producer, consumer, or competitor, and I am sure you will agree that no social system into which such things are built can undertake a spiritual mission to the world.

In the third place, the massing of capital has given rise to an intense competition of opposing interests. We have had it for a century inside the nation. To-day the thing is on a world scale, for although modern industrial development had a long start in this country, France and America, then Germany, and now the Orient have joined in the fray. It is war in another form all the time with as sure an abandonment of the issues to the arbitrament of the mere power of money, as in ordinary war things are settled by naval and military forces. As one of our great industrial leaders put it recently in defending a key industry, "There is perpetual war going on industrially."

Fourthly, the character of capital has seriously changed in one direction. The old economists defined capital as that part of a man's possessions which he expects to afford a revenue or profit, and profit was held to have some relationship to interest, but to-day the mere expectation of profit is capitalized by getting a stock exchange value, so that many shares are quoted, not at their intrinsic worth, but at a figure based on such expectation of profit as can be created through the press. This is the ground of most speculation in securities, and is a most disturbing element in trade and finance, with grave consequences to many honest folk. Is there any reason in the world why a single share should

change hands merely that some parasite may secure a margin on the re-sale ?

Again, war has shown some aspects of the wrong use of money power. The most unsavoury is profiteering. Undoubtedly the public and the nation have been exploited to a shameful extent. While many high-minded people have served their country well, far too many have served themselves better. While the nation's blood was being freely poured out in Flanders, there were men at home who were content to drink it up. The scandal of the war was conscription of life without conscription of wealth.

Government control of an industry sometimes protected the public ; sometimes it did not. Sometimes the Government itself was the greatest sinner, *e.g.*, the Committee on profits in the wool industry states that "the Government profits on wool have been on a colossal scale."

The private manufacturer was quick to follow such an attractive lead. For example, the Committee says that the pre-war profits on worsted yarns were from 1d. to 3d. per pound, while on the basis of figures prepared by the spinners themselves, the rates of profit in November and December 1919 ranged from 8½d. to 2s. 10¼d. per lb. In the Yorkshire tweed industry the post-war sales increased to four times the pre-war sales, while the net profits increased by eight times, and the wages only by three times. Cotton, steel, building materials, all tell similar tales, while we fooled ourselves by prosecuting the green-grocer for selling a penny turnip for twopence.

Lest you should think I am exaggerating about the spirit of profiteering, let us look at the facts concerning the increase in large incomes. We must remember that the nation is not richer than it was before the war, but much poorer. As a writer in *The Times* says, people see the millions of the profiteers and the great rise in wages of the workers, and that produces in the popular mind the

impression that there is any amount of new wealth about. But such wealth is not new. "It has merely been annexed from others." It is estimated that the burden of expenditure has since 1913 increased by 184 per cent., and that the ability to carry that increase (*i.e.* the productive power of the country) is now only about 80 per cent. of what it was in 1913. War fortunes have, in the language of the writer of *The Times*, "merely been annexed from others."

The number of persons who in 1917-18 paid super-tax on incomes of £5000 and upwards, as compared with the number for 1913-14, shows an increase of over 30 per cent., and the number with incomes of £25,000 and upwards an increase of 40 per cent. In 1919, 48,000 persons, out of the entire population of the United Kingdom, had an estimated total income of £340,000,000, equal to one-fifth of the whole taxable revenue of the country. It is for you to think out whether an industrial system that can yield a crop like that is likely to have moral grit for a world task.

2. Passing from capitalism, the next great feature of modern industry is the massing of population and the mushroom growth of great industrial towns, until now 78 per cent. of the population of England, and 75 per cent. of that of Scotland, are housed in urban areas. This herding into towns produces conditions in which the worker must compulsorily live.

Again, only a few illustrations can be given.

The first is housing. Here in Scotland you have nearly half of the population living in one or two roomed houses, and a million more in three roomed houses, or stated otherwise, more than 43 per cent. of your entire population in 1911 were living more than two to a room. Things are comparatively better in England, but even there one person in eleven is crowded more than two to a room. Homes have to be made under such conditions.

"Home life must suffer," and yet we affirm our faith that the home is the basis of national life.

Bad housing makes bad health. High child mortality and urbanization go together. In typical cases in Lancashire towns one child in every four born dies within five years, while in rural areas only one in ten is lost, and in garden cities like Bournville only one in sixteen. High mortality infers morbidity in those who survive, and in the result we have a C3 population, hardly the sort of people to tackle a world task.

Then bad housing and bad health, plus convenient public-houses, plus a few spells of unemployment, and we have all the conditions which go to make slums and poverty. Last year, notwithstanding old age pensions, national health insurance and unemployment benefit, we paid £19,000,000 in poor law relief to three-quarters of a million persons.

To the rise of great factory towns is traceable much of the separation of class from class. "The wealthy employer," says Lecky, "ceased to live among his people: the quarters of the rich and the poor became more distant, and soon every great city presented sharp divisions of classes and districts," and all this introduced a new factor in the social structure.

There are many other evils to be laid at the door of industrial towns, but I must pass on and come to my third point.

3. "With the coming of industrialism," says Lecky, "the war between capital and labour began. Wealth was immensely increased, but the inequalities of its distribution were aggravated. The contrast between extravagant luxury and abject misery became much more frequent and much more glaring than before." If that was true when it was written it is more true now, and it has produced a new reaction. The worker has

found that his labour is just a commodity, the value of which depends as a general rule not on any consideration concerning personality, but on supply and demand, and so employer and employed have formed opposing camps, and we have employers' associations and trades' unions. The latter were at first illegal, then tolerated, then free, and are now all-powerful. They have waged a long fight for wages and hours, for liberty to combine, for conditions of work, and now for a share in the control of industry. Antagonism has grown with the years. The roots of much of it lie in past history. But there is more than a mere sense of past wrong. There is a growing demand for a higher standard of life. The worker rightly or wrongly feels that he is up against a scheme of things which reserves all the best in life for a small class, and he finds that he is much where he was before the war. To-day the average spending power of the worker in full employment is much the same as in 1913. The Board of Trade inquiry as to wages in the United Kingdom in 1906-7 showed the average wage of all men, working full, over, or under time, in textile, clothing, building, and engineering trades, and on the railways was 30s. 1d. per week. In spending power 75s. a week now represents 30s. in 1913. £4 a week now represents 35s. then. Roughly, we are at pre-war standards of life for the worker.

The situation is aggravated by other factors than hours or wages. There is always the spectre of unemployment. The Education Committee's Report describes the uncertainty of employment as "a marked feature of modern industry." "The evil effects both upon the community and the individual are so obvious and well-known as to need no elaboration." To-day we have well over half a million unemployed and many more on short time. We witness the spectacle of 20,000 disabled men and upwards of a quarter of a million able-bodied ex-

service men walking the streets looking in vain for a job. These days are, let us hope, very exceptional, but there is always too large a margin of unemployment.

Then also there is the constant danger to life and limb in many trades. On an average, one railway worker is killed daily and about 70 injured, while in coal mines 100 a month are killed by normal accident and there are 117,000 non-fatal accidents in each year or one for every ten workers.

Towards the end of the war the Ministry of Reconstruction caused several enquiries to be made as to the best lines of national reconstruction. Among others a Committee, presided over by the Master of Balliol, was appointed to consider the provision for and possibilities of adult education (other than technical and vocational). That Committee took the extraordinary step of presenting an interim report from which I have already quoted, and which every student ought to read. The Committee state that they found it impossible to consider adult education apart from social and industrial conditions. They said that "in the course of their inquiries it had been forced on their attention that . . . industrial and social reforms are indispensable . . . if the just claims of education are to be met."

The Committee drew attention to "excessive hours of labour," which in their view "form one of the greatest obstacles to adult education"; "the evil of overtime"; the "grave difficulties" created by the shift system and split turns which are "not confined to the workers themselves, but react on the conditions of home life"; and the "too great a sacrifice of individual freedom" required by night work. "We are," say the Committee, "inclined to agree with a Birmingham mechanic who says, 'Of all the evils which infest industrial life, night work is the most damnable.'" In a review of hours of labour the Com-

mittee state that "the moral loss both to the individual and society from conditions which thwart the desire for self-expression and public service it is impossible to calculate." They add with reference to heavy work that "the sacrifice of health, of vigour, or of both, and of opportunities for engaging in the full round of educational, social, and political activities, to the supposed needs of industry would not, we are convinced, be tolerated in this country if the facts were more generally known."

The Committee go on to say that behind specific industrial obstacles to adult education "there is the important question of the relation of the whole industrial organisation to the intellectual, æsthetic, and spiritual life of the nation." "The paramount consideration is that of the individual as a member of society. Material progress is of value only in so far as it assists towards the realization of human possibilities. Industry and commerce and the social conditions which are in a large degree dependent upon them must, in our opinion, be regarded from this point of view, and if they cramp the life of the individual, no amount of argument will suffice to justify them." As we take note of the language of the Education Committee, it is well to note also that the situation in the labour world has passed into a new and interesting phase. In the old days the ruling classes led the people, and the people were content to follow, and now a new thing—democracy—has thrown up its own leaders. Labour is in organized revolt. Civil war is being waged industrially and politically. Some whose hearts fail them for fear think that soon it may be waged at the barricades.

4. Most thinking people are agreed that internationally we are attempting to rebuild society after the peace on a war basis. We are still in a state of commercial war with the whole world.

May I take two examples from the relations between

our own country and the United States to show in what a perilous position even Anglo-Saxon relations are at the moment. There is actually a cruiser on guard on the coast of Florida to prevent a British cable from being landed on the American coast because the American Government think we aim at cable monopoly in some parts of South America. The other example is the note from the American Government protesting against Great Britain's disposition to resume an exclusive attitude as regards oil resources in Mesopotamia. America is ambitious to contest our shipping position; therefore she demands that Mesopotamia oil shall be available to all. And so the commercial war goes merrily on, reckless of international complications, and at a time when the need of the world is Anglo-Saxon unity in the service of the nations.

Again our industrial system is fostering racial difficulties. The prevalent view of economic development of Empire is that it is primarily for the advantage of the British people. The fruit of that doctrine is the scandal of the Chartered Company in Rhodesia, forced labour in East Africa, and the liquor traffic in West Africa, all for private profit.

Both in the primitive civilizations of Africa and the Islands and in the hoary civilizations of the East, a new social order is evolving centering round industry. We are giving them our industrial system, and already problems have been created the way out of which is going to be long and bitter. So does evil reproduce itself in almost endless vibrations right to the far edges of the world.

Such in very rough outline are the main facts of our industrial system, a growth of the last 150 years, huge, complex, controlled by capital, the end being economic gain, carried on with ruthless competition, with employers and employed in hostile camps—a system often making

against good international relations and working mischief inter-racially.

To ask whether that kind of life is fit for a world task is to get an immediate and decisive answer, and the answer is emphasized by the greatly accelerated pace in our day of everything in industrialism. Applied science has been harnessed to industry. Forces of nature are brought into contribution. Wireless telegraphy, high-speed oil engines, the motor car, and the aeroplane all quicken the pace ; wrong tendencies and influences are more dangerous, and the possibilities of social and moral disaster are all the greater.

But we here cannot be satisfied with asking such a question and getting such an answer. We must ask the further question, "Can industry help to fit us for a world task? Can we fit it to meet the world's need?" I am not thinking at the moment of the capacity of industry to supply the world's material needs. We might fully meet all these needs ; and all the evils I have referred to might be suppressed, but we might still be no nearer a new world ; everything depends on spirit and motive and life. The need of the world to-day is a new basis for life. We can give to the world only that kind of life which we have, what we are, and what we are striving to be. All the time we are giving something. Every man who leaves these shores is a missionary. So is every man who stays at home and helps to make up the sort of life we export.

Our industrial system affects profoundly the quality of that life. It is too late in the day to question the social, moral, and spiritual consequences of an industrial system. It touches human life too closely to be non-moral. The real truth is that good Christianity can never be bad economics. A great captain of industry has said, "No man can serve two masters. He cannot serve himself and the community. He can only serve himself by

serving the community." The cry that altruism and religion has nothing to do with business is hollow and false. Surely it would be a strange God that could create the human race and make it capable of such heights, and at the same time be content that self-interest should be the rule of life for one part of His beautiful creation, and that a section of human experience should be ruled out of the sphere of religion. Let those in doubt listen to our Lord.

Jesus makes clear answer for Himself. With quiet authority He claims the lordship of all life, personal and social, industrial and commercial, international and inter-racial. To that end He calls us to follow Him.

It is unthinkable that with such a call you would care to go into life's arena and be content with the customary prize of a little more gain, a little more honour, or a little more power than your fellows. There was a day in Scotland when it was believed that the chief end of man was "to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever." The new generation, if I know it right, can recover that ideal. It is spoiling to drive from the arena the old disgusting combat and to lift the struggle of life to nobler levels. If you believe that the abundance of a man's life consisteth not in the things that he possesseth, it means that you must link yourselves with all those men who are striving to break with every principle of commerce and industry that will not stand the test of the principles of Jesus.

There are no cut-and-dried solutions. There is just the pain and the Cross and the victory. The demand that is made on you is to get at the facts for yourselves, to grasp Christian principles clearly, to apply them fearlessly and to refuse the cynical answer that business is business. To you it is given to work out a Christian doctrine for society and to fit a nation for the redemption of a world.

Such a call to such a task should thrill us through and

through and make us rise into new fullness of life. "We require," says Matthew Arnold, "to have a greatly conceived end before we can have greatness of soul and mind," and here we are called to make a new world.

There is a battle cry in the very daring nature of the idea, in the bigness of the issues, the strenuousness of the fight, the tremendous power of the forces arrayed against you, the greater forces with you, the deadly conflict between service and sacrifice and selfishness, of right against wrong, of love against hate, of life against death, and we are called to all this under the glorious leadership of Him who is the Son of Man and the Son of God.

# IS CHRISTENDOM FIT FOR A WORLD TASK ?

## (2) THE RELATIONS BETWEEN CHRISTIAN NATIONS

Miss A. MAUDE ROYDEN

WHAT do you understand by Christendom ? I suppose the society of nations which have grown up under Christian tradition. There are perhaps no nations which Christ would recognize as Christian, and many of these nations have discarded for themselves the name of Christian. Yet roughly speaking, I suppose we mean by Christendom, Europe and the Americas, and Australia—roughly the Western world—because these continents, if they have professed any religion, have professed the religion of Christ. So far as their lands, their civilization, their morals, are inspired by any ideal, it is the ideal of Jesus Christ. And no great religion has ever greatly influenced this part of the world since the coming of Christianity,—since the religions of the north, of Greece and of Rome, faded away. Asia is influenced by several religions, but Europe only by one, and so to-day I understand by Christendom roughly those nations which have at least nominally accepted the teaching of Christ.

What are the qualifications of this heterogeneous mass of people for a world task ? Perhaps they are greater than the failure of the past six years seems to suggest. It is for instance true, sometimes disastrously true, that

the West for the last few hundred years has been given the lead in the affairs of the world. The great movements which broke down the barriers of class and sex, the movement of democracy, and the women's movement, have been born in the West, and so far as the East is feeling them, it does so through those countries which call themselves Christian. Then again, it is true that by these great movements the world has been knit together by the Western countries in great international conferences, in meetings where people come to meet each other from all parts of the world. The Student Movement, born in the West, and Labour and Feminism and other great democratic movements, have brought together representatives from countries all over the world. At the last International Congress I attended before this one—a Congress of women at Geneva—there was present a large delegation of women from India, and smaller delegations came from China and Japan, and the coming of these Eastern women was regarded as a great triumph in a movement which has been for the most part a movement of Western people.

There again the whole trend of modern science has been to bind the world together; and this sprang from the West. Our swift means of communication, our swift means of transport, the way in which commerce and science between them have linked the nations together, the shrinking of the world, the interdependence of continents and countries, is due primarily to the advance of science, chiefly the work of Western scientists.

In spite of armaments, and in spite of wars, civilization has brought about a mutual dependence of the nations such as to make war a thousand times more tragic and destructive than before, and that not merely because we have developed high explosives and poison gas, but because the world is now so linked together,

that you cannot strike it at any point, without the entire world staggering under the shock.

This has been due to Western science ; and indeed we have to realize that our science becomes half useless to us unless the world is bound together. To what purpose do you throw your voice half round the world, if there is no one on the other side who wants to hear it? To what purpose do you send frozen lamb from New Zealand if there is no one in Scotland who wants to eat it? Swift transport, swift means of communication, demand for their usefulness and value, a humanity that is at one, and science has not only made us one, but for its further advance, it demands that we should continue to be one. Or rather, science has not only taught us that we must be one—it has revealed to us that we *are* one! If theology had not fought natural science, if it had been content to believe that advance in the knowledge of the world God made must be a revelation of the God who made it, we should have learned more readily the great truth that evolution is simply a lesson in the fact that life is one, that we all start from the same plane, that even the individual in a sense summarizes the progress of the whole race in his own life, that in fact we have not so much to struggle to be at one, as simply to realize the great truth—that to be one is already the law of our being, and that to violate that law means destruction and death.

And the greater part of this has come from what we call "Christendom." We have learned that the world is governed by universal law, and that, if it is so, there must be a certain unity of nature under-lying all things. We have learned that our humanity is deeper than our race, that humanity is one in the sense that Jesus Christ told us two thousand years ago, but we could not then understand it. These are, I think, our

qualifications. What are our disqualifications? What are the defects we need to be aware of before we are fit for the world task?

Well, first of all, I think, comparing the Christian West with the non-Christian East, the most striking error into which we fall is our materialism. That savage egotism which characterizes the Western nations is born of a materialistic view of life. After all, is it not rather tragic as well as comic, that after a great war, fought presumably for great ideals, it should be said in the British Parliament that we cannot defend Armenia because, after all, even the British Empire cannot police the whole world, but we must keep up a military establishment in Mesopotamia because we can always afford to police the world where there is oil? There are oil wells in Mesopotamia: there is nothing in Armenia but Armenians! Yet I have never quoted or heard quoted, in any public assembly, that wonderful passage from Ruskin, where he states that the real wealth of any community is human life, without hearing the place echoing with applause. But when we come in our statesmanship to set human life against material wealth, it is not the human life that is found worthy of the policing which is so expensive after a great war! And this spirit of materialism cannot be attributed only to the Government, but to that nation which does not utter a protest when such an ideal (if it could be called an ideal), is put forward as its official policy. It is when we are silent, it is when we accept this as a natural and right policy, it is that which makes one wonder how far Christendom is fit for any task at all, since it puts material wealth so far above human life.

Then again take an individual case. Some of you well know the work and writings of Professor Soddy, professor of inorganic chemistry, first at Aberdeen and now

at Oxford, a man who, as you know, is foremost among our authorities on inorganic chemistry, and who combines in himself a genius for the pursuit of knowledge with a passion for humanity, for which ordinary people's hearts and brains are not large enough. There is no man of science to-day in this country who combines in a greater degree this passion for humanity and for scientific truth. He tells us that science is now on the verge of the discovery of powers compared with which gas and steam and electricity are like the toys of a child's nursery, powers so tremendous that when we learn how to control them we could lift from the shoulders of humanity the burden of its toil and bring leisure and beauty and light into the lives and homes of the poorest, could abolish from the earth the struggle for existence on its material side, and make of the world something like a Garden of Eden. These are the phrases of a Professor of Chemistry; and to that man is sent a circular from the Government to ask him whether he will consent to put his time and his genius at the service of the Government, "for the exploration of the possibilities of chemical warfare!" In other words, here is a man whose one desire it is to use his matchless knowledge and genius to enrich, to ennoble and to dignify human life, who begs that the Government of this country will put at the service of science such resources as will make it possible for the scientist to research without starving; and he is answered that they will put these resources at his command and endow science not for life but for death, not to enrich and ennoble, but to invent explosives and poison gas. And again we sit silent, and by silence give consent.

Whence does all this come? From our Western egotism; for materialism means egotism. It is about material things that men fight. It is about material wealth that we are concerned, and I believe this incredible, this almost childish egotism is what makes the Eastern

nations smile a little when we allude to them in our blandly unconscious way as the "backward races." To whom is egotism so natural as to a child? I heard the League of Nations discussed by a fashionable audience in London. One of the company urged that we cannot have a League of Nations if it is going in any way to touch the British Empire. The British Empire must never give up the command of the seas, or enter into any understanding which will ever restrain any one of its activities and powers. The speaker replied that if we were going to take that point of view, we must reflect that America was at least equal to us in the power to build a great navy, and was already considering how great that navy ought to be; whereupon a lady in the audience said brightly—"Oh, if the League of Nations could prevent *America* from building——!" How is that for pure childishness?

Again, our assumption that the world is there for us Western nations to exploit; the idea that the vast wealth of Africa, the vast resources of such a great country as China, are there merely to be carved out into "spheres of influence" for nations richer in material power. Is that attitude possible to Christendom confronting a world task? With what face shall we set about that task, we British people, that task which implies respect for others, and the knowledge that they also have something to teach us, with such a running sore in our own Empire as Ireland or India? Do you know that some liberal-minded British people, who truly desire to see the end of the horror in Ireland, will offer to Ireland anything that Ireland demands, with only one proviso, that it should be compatible with the safety of the British Empire? That is the greatest, the widest offer which comes from the British people! Here is a little nation of four millions, now poor, not strong from a military point of view, with no army compared with ours, and no navy at all, and we are offering to that tormented

country everything that is compatible with the safety of the British Empire! How is that for egotism, oh British people? To my mind what we have got to do when we touch any country, whether politically or commercially, or in any other way, is to consider what is best for that country, and not solely or even primarily what is safe for ourselves.

And the last disqualification surely is that we have allowed our egotism and our materialism to make so great havoc in the world already, that if it can still be said we give a lead to the world, we must ask ourselves into what we are leading it. Progress does not always mean progress in the right direction. If the world is arming to-day; if China, that great and peaceful people, is at last considering whether she also shall not enter the race of armaments; if America, who for over a century has had the longest undefended frontier in the world, is now planning the building of the greatest of all navies; if Japan is industrializing herself, and India following her example, we may still indeed claim that we have led the world. But whither, in the name of God, are we leading it? Surely the war has been the greatest disqualification of all, because it means that we are leading nations, hitherto unarmed, hitherto unmilitarized, to share our own belief in brutal and savage force, feeling that they cannot otherwise escape destruction.

And yet Europe received Christ. Oh, amazing conquest! Surely the world has not yet realized the significance of that triumph. That China should hear Confucius, that India should receive the Buddha, these were easy conquests compared with the fact that Europe worships Jesus of Nazareth. What a God for a Charlemagne, a Hildebrand, an Otto! What a God for Europe! It does, I think, measure something of the power of Jesus Christ that this materialistic, egotistic Western world should be the place where His throne has been set.

We should not despair of the West, remembering that it was a little thing for a great spiritual and peaceful religion to conquer one of the great peoples of Asia, compared with the amazing moral miracle that the West has accepted Jesus Christ.

Is it not possible, then, that we are about to learn the last (which was also the first) of the three lessons of our great charter—the fundamental unity of all races? That “in Jesus Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek?” Is it not an irony that that was, in fact, the first step made by the Christian Church, the first barrier that was broken down? Christians did not understand at first that neither subjection of class nor of sex was truly Christ-like; but they did understand that there must be no difference between Jew and Greek; and yet to-day it seems as if that was to be the last of all the lessons that Christendom will lay to heart. Yet there is being born in our hearts—the Student Movement itself bears witness to it—something of that hungry desire for the brotherhood of man, that seeking for it, that knocking at the door, which inevitably brings its answer. At no time has that tragic poem of Matthew Arnold meant more than to-day:

“ Yes ; in the sea of life enisled  
With sounding straits between us thrown,  
Dotting the shoreless watery wild,  
We mortal millions live *alone*.  
The islands feel the enclasping flow,  
And then their endless bounds they know.

Oh, then a longing like despair  
Is to their farthest caverns sent ;  
For surely once, they feel, we were  
Parts of a single continent.  
Now round us spreads the watery plain—  
Oh, might our marges meet again !

Who ordered that their longing's fire  
Should be, as soon as kindled, cool'd ?

Who renders vain their deep desire ?  
A God, a God their severance rul'd ;  
And bade between their shores to be  
The unplumb'd, salt, estranging sea ! ”

These lines of Matthew Arnold haunt us to-day. But we do not now give the answer that he gave, or lay the blame where he laid it. And I suggest that our great qualification, perhaps the greatest of all for our task, is precisely this, that we Western people do not easily admit that our limitations, our prejudices, our faults even, are laid upon us by God. “God,” says Arnold, “God their severance ruled.” No, not God, but we ourselves ! Not fate, but our deliberate selfishness “bade between our shores to be the unplumbed, salt, estranging sea.” Not God but we ourselves have divided the world into these lonely islands. And we have now to realize that under “the salt, estranging sea,” islands are but the mountain-tops of the great earth which is one.

What ought we to do ? To begin with, what is the Christian view of patriotism for your own country, and the right Christian attitude to other countries ? I do not think that Christ was lacking in love to His own people, but His love to His own people expressed itself in an exquisitive sensitiveness to the service that it was to do to the world. It was to Him an agony that the Jews failed, because they were His own people, the people God had set apart for that particular work ; but it was for their work for the world that He cared. It was for the way they could serve the world that He loved them, and His patriotism was a deep sensitiveness to the gifts His people should have given to the service of humanity. So should our patriotism be. And we should learn from it to realize that other countries also have their gifts to offer, their service to perform. We should not be so ready to assume that a different gift means an inferior one, or a different civilization a “backward” one.

Remember that all the great religions of the world to-day were born among the "backward" peoples of Asia! Remember that scientific advance, great as it is, is less than the spiritual genius of the races whose religious teaching has conquered the world. Should not our attitude to other nations be, not only—what can we do to help them? but also—what can they teach us? What can we learn from them? I would urge this not only of these great Asiatic civilizations, but of all other countries, all other races. The races of Africa, for instance—must we for ever think of them only as a people whom we are to help? Is it not just possible that they may have something to give us? Some gift for the spiritual good of the world? At least I am certain that we shall only find it if we are looking for it, and that all Christian people should have an attitude of respect for every nation on the earth, for every people however different, however in some respects "backward," since, like ourselves, they are the children of God.

The way in which we strong nations exploit the helpless is, to my mind, one of the darkest blots on Christian records. Even the League of Nations Covenant is in this respect a very doubtful advance; and the way in which the "mandates" article is interpreted and applied should be anxiously watched by all, to whatever country they belong. The attitude of the League towards the weaker nations is a crucial test.

It is a hopeful sign that at the first meeting of the Assembly there was elected to the Council of the League the representative of a people, great indeed in numbers, the greatest of all, greater even than India, and of a civilization as ancient; but from a military point of view almost negligible. I mean China. That weak countries should be asked to give their services to the world, and send their statesmen to the parliament of the world, that men from little countries, men like Nansen of Norway

and Branting of Sweden, should make as great a mark there as the representatives of the greatest military powers—Lord Robert Cecil for the British Empire and Viviani of France—is in itself a proof of how much the world has to gain by respecting the little nations. They are here to serve, and that service should be given to the whole world and in the light of day. What am I preaching to you after all but simple Christianity? Open diplomacy is Christian diplomacy. The secret treaty is condemned because it is secret. "Those love darkness whose deeds are evil." That is a saying two thousand years old, but it is as true of treaties as of murders! People love darkness because their deeds are evil. The treaty that is secret is the treaty which cannot bear the light. Open diplomacy, that new phrase coined during the war, is simply the world's international and political expression of the truth that our Lord laid down so long ago, and which again we would not believe.

Let us sum up the situation. We have the scientific knowledge that the unity of man is not a mere phrase but a fundamental fact. We have the bitter experience of the war to teach us that we cannot violate that fundamental law without chaos, destruction, and death. But what we lack still is the spirit—the faith in human nature, the belief that it is *possible* for nations to be Christian. It is this lack which lies at the back of our secret diplomacy, our exploitations, our belief in force, our fear of each other, our perpetual suspicions. If people of goodwill everywhere would *believe* in the brotherhood of man, the League of Nations would become a living reality. But they dare not. They cannot believe that it is possible for nations to grow into the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. What is lacking in Christendom for its world task? Christianity? The belief in Christ—that is the lacking thing in Christendom.

Perhaps it is necessary for the Western mind to

approach a great spiritual truth by an intellectual path. I think it may be so. It is, after all, a great path, a noble way; but if it is necessary, then surely we are on the threshold of the last step—the discovery that we cannot hurt each other without wounding ourselves, that the world is one as the human body is one, and is so united that all over its surface it is vulnerable and cannot be struck at one point without suffering everywhere. The intellectual conviction is there, perhaps we are on the edge of the spiritual experience also. Christ taught us that it lay with us to heal the wounds of the world. It is not God who makes us poor or sick, but we ourselves. These things are against the will of God. It is not God who makes us suffer: it is we who bring it on ourselves. Perhaps that is why with all our waywardness we Western people worship Christ: because He gives us such a mighty hope. The belief that goodness can triumph, that hope will not be betrayed, the refusal to accept as our fate things against which we still have the power to struggle—this is the gift of the Western peoples, the gift which, with all our faults, does fit us for a world task.

Beneath the sea the islands are all one, beneath the nations humanity is one, beneath the creeds the love of God is one. What, then, keeps us apart? Our own egotism. The pain of our divisions, the agony of war, bankruptcy, famine, and disease that stalk the world. These things are not imposed by God; they will last as long as we choose. But the unity of the world is a divine and fundamental law. Those, therefore, who work for it are working not against human nature, but with it; not against all that civilization has taught us, but for it; not against fate, but with the will of God. Take courage! God wants us to be one. *Id Deus vult!* God wills it!

## THE CONTACTS OF THE WEST WITH ASIA AND AFRICA

### (1) THROUGH COMMERCE AND THE PROFESSIONS

Sir HENRY E. E. PROCTER, Bombay

I HAVE been asked to tell you something from my own experience of the impact of Christendom on India, and how a Britisher, whose life-work lies in the East, can make some contribution to the spreading of the Kingdom of God. I feel very diffident in doing so, as I am not a speaker but just an ordinary business man, and my only justification in accepting the invitation is that I have been thirty years in the East and have an intense interest in the peoples of India and the many problems which at present confront us out there. I also feel that giving you the results of my own personal experience may be a help to some of you, and particularly to those who are going to live their lives in India or the Far East.

I would say, in the first place, that every Britisher who goes out to India, whether in Government service or in business, carries a responsibility which he may not admit or realize but which is there nevertheless. He is regarded as a representative of the Christian religion by the Indian peoples, and by his actions Christianity is judged and valued. It may not be fair to judge a religion by the lives of those who are only nominally its followers, but it is only natural that the Indian peoples, who are intensely religious themselves, and who can understand anything

except a man being without religion, should do so. I think, therefore, that a man going out to India should fully realize he is a missionary for Christianity whether he likes it or not, and that the only way he can get rid of his responsibility is to leave the country. This being so, it will be seen that in the spread of the Kingdom of God in India the lives lived by the Europeans there mean far more than would at first sight be realized. Missionaries, of course, do the pioneer work, and their lives and work count for much, but in many ways the lives of the ordinary Europeans count for more, because while the Indian looks upon missionaries as religious men, and as such expects them to be what they are, he regards the ordinary Europeans as the product of Christianity, and if he sees their lives really lived up to a high standard in accordance with our Lord's teaching, then he realizes that the Christian has something which his own religion does not give him. India is being steadily Christianized in three ways—directly by missionary propaganda and teaching, indirectly by the lives of British men and women in India, and both directly and indirectly by Indian Christians themselves, whose influence and work in this direction are being increasingly felt.

Ten years ago Sir Narayan Chandavarkar, a prominent Hindu judge in Bombay, gave an address at the Bombay Y.M.C.A., entitled "The Kingdom of Christ and the Spirit of the Age," and in it he said :

"Let me tell you what I consider the greatest miracle of the present day : it is this, that to this great country, with its 300 millions of people, there should come from a little island, unknown by name even to our forefathers, many thousand miles distant from our shores and with a population of but fifty to sixty millions, a message so full of spiritual life and strength as the Gospel of Christ. This surely is a miracle if ever there was one. And this

message has not only come, but it is finding a response in our hearts, for, as I have already indicated to you, the old conception of a spiritual worship of God has not entirely perished from the minds of the people, though it may be buried below a mass of ceremony and superstition. The process of the conversion of India to Christ may not be going on as rapidly as you hope, or in exactly the manner that you hope, but nevertheless I say that India is being converted; the ideals that lie at the heart of the Gospel of Christ are slowly but surely permeating every part of Hindu society and modifying every phase of Hindu thought. And this process must go on as long as those who preach this Gospel seek above all things to commend it, not so much by what they say, but by what they do and the way they live."

Now, does not this bring home to us the responsibility of every British man and woman in India to live his or her life at the highest level? You may ask me how a Britisher can make his best contribution to the spreading of the Kingdom of God in India. Well, I think he must first realize that we British are in India to carry out God's purpose for the good of India as a whole, and not merely for the purpose of making money. That being so, he should really try to get to know the people and so be able to sympathize with their aspirations. I am convinced that if self-government is to succeed in India, it can only do so by a real co-operation of all sections of the community, including the British; and that if racial distinctions are brought in from either side, it will only result in constant friction and consequent loss of power and eventual failure. Personally I should like to see all racial distinctions set aside, and efficiency made the test. If it can be done I feel sure that India will go ahead rapidly and self-government attain the success we all want it to be.

Then as regards commercial life in which the English-

man meets the Indian, there is a real responsibility to maintain a high standard, though I am afraid this is not always recognized. If the question was put to many of the business men in Bombay or Calcutta as to what is the proper standard of business morality, I think it would be found that each one had a standard of his own, and that that standard would as often as not be pitched to suit his own requirements, so that in reality it was no standard at all. In speaking on this subject some years ago in Bombay, I pointed out that most business was carried on in accordance with one of the three following standards: (1) the dishonest standard; (2) the world's standard; (3) God's standard.

The first standard requires no explanation or defence, as it is admittedly wrong on the face of it. The second standard is the one commonly accepted, not necessarily a dishonest one, but a standard of expediency, very elastic and made to fit in with a man's requirements. The third standard is God's standard, by which a man strives to do everything in accordance with God's will, trying to give God the pre-eminence in all things, and when in business he has to make a decision, he asks for God's guidance and does the right thing, even if it means losing the business. Now of these standards I think you will be with me when I affirm that the only right one is God's standard, but as I have already said, it is the second one which is commonly accepted. Practices exist in business which, judged by God's standard, are utterly wrong, and yet which are going on daily, and in my opinion undermining our commercial foundations as well as bringing discredit on Christianity.

I will not weary you with many instances, but just mention two which will serve as examples of what I mean. The first is the practice of secret commissions, by which I mean the giving of a commission secretly to an employee

of a firm or company with whom the business is being done, in order to obtain the business. The fact that it is always done secretly is proof in itself that it is wrong, as otherwise there would be no object in not doing it openly. It is an unfair method of competition, and is doubly injurious because it is not only dishonest, but it seriously injures the man who accepts the commission by tempting him to place the business of his employers not in their interests but in his own. The test as to whether it is right or wrong lies in the fact that no firm would knowingly keep in its employ a servant who they knew accepted such commissions. The reason generally given for doing such things is that others do it, and if you want to obtain business you have got to do the same as they do. This, of course, is due entirely to the want of a high standard in business. Another instance is in connection with tariffs. As an example I would mention the custom of Insurance Companies binding themselves together by an agreement to charge certain rates and give certain discounts. Under such an arrangement as this, it is of course utterly wrong for any of the signatories to give a larger discount than that agreed upon, and yet it is constantly done in order to obtain business, and the excuse generally given is that unless they do so they must miss the business.

Now you cannot reconcile Christ's teachings with such practices, and yet it is these practices which the peoples of India with whom we come in contact in business see constantly made use of, and value Christianity accordingly. I have no hesitation in saying that if Christians would carry their religion into their commercial life, as they ought to do, and would work their business in accordance with God's standard, the world would be a different place, and Christianity would spread rapidly through those brought in contact with it recognising the power behind it. This, I think you will agree with me, is a way in which

Britishers in India can really help forward the Kingdom of God in that country. In my opinion the only real way to raise the moral standard of a community is to do so individually. What is everybody's business is generally nobody's business, and as long as you talk in generalities about business immorality, everybody will agree with you and nothing will be done ; but a community is made up of individuals, and if you can bring home to men, one by one, their individual responsibility for the state of things which exists, and get them to realise that each can contribute his share towards improving matters, that will be a step in the right direction.

But in order to take this step they will require power, and the only power which will be sufficient for them is Christianity and the determination to follow Christ's example in all things, and to remember that there is no middle course between right and wrong. And we must always remember that if men are to be able to live their lives up to God's standard their characters must be built up, and in this connection I cannot do better than quote Mr Henry King's words in an address written by him entitled "The Fight for Character." He writes :—

"The one unfailing way to character is persistent association with Christ. The only effective way to character we know is through personal association with the best. Only as men put themselves persistently and habitually in His presence, is character secured. The most powerful forces in life are personal, and of all personal relations the incomparable one is the relation to God in Jesus Christ."

So it is by bringing men into persistent association with Christ and with all that is best in life that we can help to remedy the failings in our business life.

And there is also another way that we may help, and that is by our own lives being without reproach. It is

not so much what a man says or does which tells, but what he is. We cannot serve God better than by living consistent lives and being always ready to forget ourselves in the service of others, not to seek our own but others' good, and to be able to realize and admit that what we think is the right line to take may not be God's plan at all, and to be always ready to give God the pre-eminence in all things. I say these things because I know how Christians are watched, and how necessary it is for them that their lives and actions should be absolutely consistent if they are to help forward and not retard the Kingdom of God.

Then as regards the economic position in India I should like to say a few words, and in doing so, I would say that I am thinking principally of the condition of things in Bombay, where my life has been largely spent. There is and has been a vast amount of loose talk on this subject, and if you read the extreme Indian papers or the speeches of the Indian extremists, you would believe that India and the Indian people were being exploited for the benefit of the foreign capitalists under the approval of the Indian Government. As a matter of fact, as far as I can judge, the real state of things is exactly the opposite, and although the Government of India may have made mistakes, as I suppose all Governments do, it has during the past fifty years a record of which every Britisher has a right to be proud. It is true that at first, in order to construct railways, canals, roads, telegraphs, and other remunerative works, the Government of India was obliged to borrow money in England, for the simple reason that the Indian peoples would not invest their own money in such enterprises, but preferred to hoard it. That money was borrowed at 5 per cent., and although for the first few years there was a loss on these enterprises, that loss was soon turned into a gain, and the

Government's investments in railways, canals, etc., have not only proved a financial success, but have also been the means of developing the resources of India in a way undreamt of fifty years ago. In this way foreign capital has been a blessing to India, and not the blighting influence which the Indian extremists would lead us to believe it was. Of late years the Indian peoples have more and more invested their money in industrial enterprises instead of hoarding it, and, speaking of the Bombay side, I may say that practically all the capital for industrial enterprises, including the cotton mills and feeder railways, has been raised locally.

In these enterprises British firms are largely interested, and in many instances act as managing agents. As such they have considerable influence, and I think I can say that it has been chiefly exercised for good. For instance, it was a Britisher who first raised his voice against the long hours worked in cotton mills in Bombay, and *The Times of India*, a British paper, which took it up and drew public attention to it. Hours will probably have to be still further reduced (they are now ten hours), but many mill-owners realize that it is not sufficient simply to reduce hours unless you provide recreation and educational facilities for the extra leisure afforded, otherwise it only means more time for them to spend in the liquor shops. Many mills, therefore, have started institutes and recreation halls for their employees, with very good results; and I hope this will eventually spread to all mills. May I give you a concrete case to illustrate what is being done by a mill under British agents, with a board of British and Indian directors? This mill has recently put up an institute for its employees, consisting of a large hall for cinema entertainments and lantern lectures, a library and reading-room, where indoor games can be played and educational classes are held; an open

space for outdoor games, a tea-shop, co-operative stores where they can purchase their grain, and a co-operative society where they can invest their savings. In order to start the institute, the Y.M.C.A. lent the services of one of their Indian secretaries for several months, and on his leaving, the duties were taken over by two of the Indian employees themselves. The whole institute is managed by a committee of the Indian employees, with the help of one or two of the European staff. It is run on co-operative lines, and I hope that similar institutes will be started by most of the other mills in the country, as I am sure that they will be the means of much good.

Then again, as regards housing, owing to the rapid development of mills and factories in Bombay, there has been a great demand for house accommodation and a consequent serious over-crowding. Bombay mill-owners have been blamed very bitterly for not providing accommodation for their labour, but while it may be expedient for them to do so in their own interests, I cannot see that it can be regarded as their duty or responsibility, any more than it is the duty of every business firm in London or Glasgow to provide house-room for its staff, which I do not think for a minute has ever been suggested. Many mill-owners in Bombay and Calcutta have provided, and are providing house accommodation for their labour, and in all these matters concerning the welfare of the labouring classes, British firms can and should do all in their power to set an example.

I think it will be seen from what I have said that the Britisher in India has a great responsibility and a real influence in the commercial and industrial life of the country and its economical development. It therefore follows that it is of paramount importance that those who go out to India should be men of high ideals, prepared to take trouble in getting to know the

Indian peoples and to sympathize with their aspirations, and also to take their share in public life. To this latter I attach great importance, as hitherto the majority of Britishers have been entirely wrapped up in their own business and refused to take their share in public affairs. As I have said above, I believe the success of the new reforms depends entirely upon the active co-operation of all sections of the community, and it will therefore be necessary for the British to give up a good deal more time than hitherto to public life. A Britisher going out to India on business should realize that he has a part to play in the industrial and economic development of the country and a responsibility in helping it to be developed on right lines, commercially and industrially. Personally, I feel that the future welfare of India largely depends on the type of men who go out there from Great Britain during the next twenty years. If they are of the right stamp—men of vision, kindly, sympathetic and of high ideals, with a desire and determination to work for the good of India and its peoples—I believe their influence for good will be immense, and that the self-government now being tried will be a success. If, on the other hand, men of the wrong type are sent—men without vision, men who regard India purely as a market for their goods and as a place to make money, men who take no trouble to get to know the Indian peoples and sympathize with them—then racial feeling will become worse than ever, and the reforms will completely fail in their object, and self-government be farther off than ever.

And may I conclude these somewhat disjointed experiences by a quotation from the "Pattern on the Mount" by Phillips Brooks, who says :

"If you give up your life to serving and loving Christ, one of the blessings of your consecration of yourself to Him will be that in Him will open to you this pattern of

## 84 *The Contacts of the West with Asia and Africa*

yourself. You will see your possible self as He sees it, and your one purpose will be to realize it. To go to him and get the perfect ideal of life and of every action of life and then to go forth and by His strength fulfil it, that is the New Testament conception of a strong, successful life."

My prayer is that every British man and woman going out to India may go to Christ and get from Him the perfect ideal of life and then by His strength fulfil it in their individual lives, and so bring home to those they come in contact with what Christianity really means.

## THE CONTACTS OF THE WEST WITH ASIA AND AFRICA

### (I) THROUGH COMMERCE AND THE PROFESSIONS

E. C. CARTER, Y.M.C.A.

"THE whole war was a struggle for observation points, for high ground from which you could see." Before this conference closes may we ourselves attain high ground from which we may see that the manufacturer and the engineer may be as potent bearers of the goodwill of the Kingdom of God as the missionary or the priest. Some students are saying, "I am not good enough to be a missionary abroad, I shall be a merchant or an engineer." My claim to-day is that the world situation demands exactly the same standard of private life and professional performance of the foreign merchant as of the foreign missionary.

Viscount Grey voiced our deep conviction this morning that we must do away with war. Let all who think of entering commerce remember that for over a hundred years struggles for trade have been a greater cause of war than struggles for land. In vying with the French companies for the monopoly of Indian trade the East India Company dragged its Government into war with France. Modern European Imperialism has been motivated more by desire for trade than for territory. 1914 exploded the insidious theory that trade brings peace, for almost invariably the expansion of trade in-

creases irritation between the nations. Western commerce in some of its contacts with Asia and Africa has been degrading, as for example the opium trade in China. The first commercial importation into Africa was of rifles and gin. It is said that our colonial ancestors in New England developed Harvard and supported the Puritan churches by their profits on the triangular ocean trade of carrying New England gin to Africa, conveying slaves from Africa to Virginia, and there loading contraband supplies for Boston. India has frequently felt herself the pawn of Lancashire. Read the great book on the negroes in America, "Darkwater," by Du Bois, and the little pamphlet by the Bishop of Zanzibar, "The Serfs of Great Britain, being a sequel to the Black Slaves of Prussia." From these you will realize how much progress has yet to be made both by the American and the British people in their treatment of their coloured fellow citizens.

Commerce and industry have tended to impose on parts of Asia the curses of Western industrialism. Long hours, child labour, inadequate housing, failure to provide for accident prevention, and avoidance of occupational diseases, have in the East, as in the West, given evidence of lack of appreciation of the value of human personality. Often commercial cupidity and the Government's need of revenue have been in alliance against the good of the people. The engineer and the merchant, like the teacher, the doctor, and even the missionary, have frequently adopted the common Anglo-Saxon attitude of superiority toward other races, little realizing the devastating character of this fiercest of social poisons.

Commerce and the professions have, nevertheless, been great allies as well as great foes of Christianity. In many parts of the world the Englishman's word is known to be as good as his bond. Furthermore, his

daily activity has been of untold value to the peoples of Asia and Africa.

The Interchurch Commission which investigated the steel strike stated that the object of the United States Steel Corporation was not to make steel but to make money. Two decades ago we would have retorted, "Well, why shouldn't it?" To-day we know that the first aim of a steel works is to make steel. It must, of course, give a fair return alike to labour and capital, but its chief purpose must be the manufacture of steel for the public use.

"When any master holds 'twixt hand and chin a violin of mine, he will be glad that Stradivarius lived, made violins, and made them of the best. For while God gives them skill, I give them instruments to play upon, God using me to help Him. . . . If my hand slacked I should rob God since He is fullest good, leaving a blank behind instead of violins. He could not make Antonio Stradivarius' violins without Antonio."

Our aim must be to *serve* by making rails or ploughs or roads or bread or cloth. If, in the making, our hands slack, we rob both God and man. Only as business and industry become *professions* can they survive in the new order. When the merchant aims to serve society not with the profits of his trade but by means of his trade, he may make his trade routes the highway for the Kingdom.

Much lost ground has to be regained. As Fulani Bin Fulani says: To the Arab in Africa "Christianity stands for the political dominance of an alien race and a scheme of industry based on the pursuit of profit, conducted under laws and rules that seem to him unjust. It is idle to invite him to know and love a God who entered our life to share and save it so long as we interpret that salvation without reference to what in his

experience are the most important functions of human life."

The Christian business man of to-morrow will look back with amazement to the record of a British steamship company which succeeded in crushing the effort of the people of India to establish an Indian steamship company to handle part of the Indian trade between certain Indian ports. He will frown on the American Oil Company that sought to oust both British and Burmese owners from the oil fields of Burma. The Christian merchant or manufacturer of to-morrow, while being tolerant of the wickedness of our present industrial order (for which all of us are to blame), will be intolerant of perpetuating it. He will regard it as a greater sin for an Anglo-Saxon to exploit human life in Mexico or Asia than to exploit his fellow-citizens in America or England. He will apply to his factories in the Orient the Christian principles which the modern social movement are teaching him to apply to industrial life in the Occident. He will remember that he is a guest when he is abroad. He will study the history and hopes of the peoples he employs. He will not dare to regard them as inferiors. He will lead them to the place where they will become his fellow-workers in the service of mankind.

Would that we might eliminate the word "prestige" from our interracial vocabulary. Viscount Grey said that the war lowered European prestige in the eyes of Asia. Did it not rather *reveal* our lack of prestige, our lack of character. As used in the East, European "prestige" means the artificial atmosphere of place and power, and does not spell moral character.

"Henceforth I call you friends." Trust begets trust. In some Indian cities one host tells you there are no good servants. Another in the same city says, "this is quite a remarkable place for servants, they are

loyal, honest, and efficient." The difference is not in the servants, but in the masters. Sir Henry Procter, who has just spoken, has had loyal service from great numbers of Indian employees. The reason is because he believes in his staff. In my own short fifteen years' contact with India I have been told a thousand times of the unreliability of Indians. Personally, I have been blessed with friends of a different sort. I do not remember a single case of an Indian friend who has let me down.

Asia and Africa will long have need of professional and commercial men who will go abroad at the call of God. It will be a more difficult and hazardous career than that of most missionaries. And for this very reason it may be all the more worth while, for what the world demands to-day is not so much the promulgation of Christian principles as the careful application of the principles of Christ to everyday life. Launch forth, then, on this adventure. Prepare for criticism of your idealism, opposition from your competitors, scorn or pity from your friends. Bind yourself into the uncounted company of those who are determined "to give all men a fair chance at all good things." Forget for ever that "business is business" and that "Christianity doesn't work out in everyday life." Bide your time, keep your vision unclouded, and the day will come when you are manager of a mill on the Hooghly or Colonel of a regiment on the frontier, when at the beginning of the day's work your men will verily believe you are saying to them, "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest . . . my yoke is easy and my burden is light." Yokes? Yes. Burdens? Yes—but gladly and gaily borne because your men and you are fellow-workers with God in the building of His Kingdom.

# THE CONTACTS OF THE WEST WITH ASIA AND AFRICA

## (2) THROUGH GOVERNMENT

Sir WILLIAM MARRIS, K.C.S.I., Governor-Elect of Assam

UPON the subject of which I have been invited to speak to you I suppose that a large book might be written. I am not likely to write such a book; but it is only now, in thinking out what the question involves, that I realize into what deep places it takes us, and how unfitted I am to fathom many of them. I must be content to suggest certain general propositions and lines of inquiry, which those better fitted than myself and with more leisure may perhaps profitably pursue. And since one must have the concrete in view to some extent, if only as a means of testing one's generalities, I shall speak of the East mainly in terms of India, for that is the only East that I know; and also, with the possible exception of Mesopotamia and Egypt, it is that portion of the Eastern world where these problems of the science of government are in their most interesting stage.

Let us begin with the broad differences of government in the two halves of the world, and go on to look at the process which is attempting to bring them together; and finally examine in the light of what is known or may be conjectured about their points of divagation in the past the prospects of their fusion in the future.

We people of the British Isles have been the inventors

of a method of deciding all public questions, which has spread over the greater part of the civilized world. The United States borrowed it from us, with variations in the relations of executive and legislative, which are unimportant for our purpose. Continental countries have imitated, even while not always clearly understanding it, and with variations of greater importance, such as the committee system in France. But it is in the later daughter states overseas that it has been reproduced with the greatest faith and confidence. What are its essential elements? Public business consists, I suppose, first in settling the laws of the country, and then determining how they shall be carried out. This business of legislation and administration is committed to a body of representatives chosen by the people, who retain their seats so long as the people wish; and who act through what is practically, though not in form, an elected committee, known as the Government, of which they can get rid if it displeases them. Now we all know that the reality may not correspond to the picture. We hear of the Cabinet's disregard of the Commons, and of the electorate's lost faith in Parliament; and there are those who say that these are the symptoms of a creeping paralysis which afflicts democracy, and that events are moving to some new development. However that be, let us take the system as we have known it. We shall agree, I think, that its essential elements are two. In the first place the actions of Government are ultimately controlled by the wishes of the individual citizen, and secondly the process of focussing and ascertaining the general will is provided by the representative system, which chooses the members of Parliament, and by the tradition that the head of the Government must be acceptable to the majority of those members (or if any question as to this point arises) to the majority of the electors.

Neither proposition has hitherto been true of Asia. You have not had responsible government. You have not had the representative system. Asia has been a land of theocratic and military monarchies. Sometimes the laws were made by the king as mouthpiece of the gods, and in such cases the real power was often that of a strongly organized priesthood. Sometimes the soldier ruled, and was strong enough to defy the priests, who saved their face as best they could. But the only check upon autocracy was the opposition of powerful nobles or possible rivals for the throne. The common people approached the Government as suppliants, much as they approached the temple god ; a beneficial rule was welcomed as might be a good harvest ; an iron rule accepted as might be a pestilence or famine.

Why did the two parts of the world take such different paths ? Why did public opinion never organize itself in the East, and send emissaries to the centre, and say that this or that thing must be done or must cease ? Some people will tell you that it is due to the "innate inertia" of the East. They will suggest that a certain torpor of mind and body besets the Asiatic, and trace it to the enervating effects of a hot climate over thousands of years. Some will tell you that it is the result of Asia's absorption in spiritual things ; she cares more, they say, for the soul than for the body ; pursuing her higher meditative end, she lets the legions thunder past and plunges in thought again. Many will point to the configuration of the country, with its vast plains and rivers which lent easy access to foreign conquerors' armies or the forays of marauding chiefs, and militated against the growth of any local rival to the central power. But the feature of Indian life that marks it out most clearly from the life of Europe is the dominating factor of caste ; caste, which segregates a man within the particular circle into which he was born, and shapes

his thoughts and life with reference to that circle far more than to anything beyond it. Whatever the value of the other factors, here at least is something in the social life of the country which must have profoundly affected its political life as well.

The origin of caste is one of those questions on which the last word has not yet been said ; but perhaps we shall not go far wrong in treating it as a protective device intended to secure purity of blood. Into its later developments other factors may have entered ; but there appear strong grounds for holding that the majority of Aryan invaders from the North felt so keenly the necessity of preventing themselves from being merged in the darker or yellower peoples whom they encountered, that they laid down hard and fast laws against praying or feasting or marrying with them. These are the three great tests of caste to this day. There are certain religious offices prohibited except to the Brahman ; the limitations within which castes or sub-castes may feed together are very strict ; and even now a Bill permitting intermarriage between different castes has failed to secure effective support in the Indian legislature. Think what this means. " Thy people are not my people, nor thy God my God." Over thousands of years the immense influences of religion, tradition and custom have tended not to unite but to seclude men from one another ; to confirm them in their particular prejudices, habits, and characteristics. Think of the effects of intermarriage in this country, and how it has invigorated the blood and enriched the character ; think of the broadening of knowledge and sympathies which comes to a family which sends sons into the Civil Service, the Church, the Army, the Navy, and business ; or, to put the case more fancifully, imagine how different this country would be if all Smiths were still in the hardware business, and if the banns of marriage could not be

published between John Hunter and Mary Baker. Isolation, and the domination of the superior caste, may have hardened and preserved the caste system in a way peculiar to India. Yet in essentials is there anything peculiarly Indian or Asiatic about it? If the nation is only the tribe writ large, and the tribe only the expanded household; if society existed first in the form of the household, then caste restrictions are only the carrying out on a larger scale of what was inevitable in the days when there were only tribes, whose members reckoned that they were of one blood. But this state of things prevailed, so far as early history can tell us, not in Asia only but in Europe too. Is it not here, then, in the early mists of European history that we should look for the critical parting of the ways?

The germ of popular institutions, as we know them, lies in the assembling of the City states of Greece. True, the device of election for representative purposes had not been invented, and the people assembled as a whole to pass laws or even to take executive decisions. But at least their allotment was territorial from an early date, and all men dwelling as neighbours were assumed to have common interests. Now this was not the original state of things. We know that in the nomad period people acted not as neighbours but as blood relations, as they still do in India: and the transition from one to the other was perhaps one of the greatest events of human history. Can we see how it occurred? It may, like other big things, have been very simple. As the migrations ceased the members of a clan went hither and thither to seek a living. Whatever central power existed used to call on the head of the tribe for its quota for the army or the revenue. But as the tribes disintegrated and the members scattered, it became more and more troublesome for the headmen to apportion the quota between the members.

It was so much simpler to forget the tribal tie and to treat all those living in a certain neighbourhood as liable for a certain contribution, and as capable of settling its apportionment among themselves. So we get the deme, the first parent of our own territorial constituencies, appearing first in the reforms of the Athenian lawgiver Cleisthenes ; and once it appears, the old clan organization in 'phratrias' or brotherhoods grows steadily weaker and soon survives only for religious purposes. Surely what we see here is the passing of the caste system into the democratic. The common obligation to contribute to defence gave rise to the habit of common deliberation and action : men thought of their neighbours as like men with themselves and not as aliens, and as the central power was weak and communities were small and distances short, it was easy for the people of the deme to develop into a common state authority and take their part in joint decisions. But the important thing to bear in mind is that the democratic institutions which we Westerns think almost inevitable, are in origin possibly the result of new feelings and interests called into existence by a mere change of method which was the result of sheer convenience.

Why did nothing like this happen in India ? I have mentioned some retarding factors. But possibly the main reason was that great central monarchies were able to impose their laws and taxation too easily on the people. The land was not broken up into the pockets which produce small individual communities ; and the Mogul Empire which preceded ours sent out its Nawabs and collectors to gather its share of the produce or to enrol its forces by means of a great survey and registration of the whole country, and never felt the need of calling on the local bodies to settle things for themselves.

Whether this explanation suffice or not, the broad fact remains. India has never known democracy as the

West has known it. Many Indians think otherwise, and fancy that in their village communities and their executive committees of the past is to be seen the spirit of democracy. I believe that to be historically a mistake. Within the caste there was consultation and there was decision by the elders: but unless the village was a one-caste village, its administration was no democracy but an oligarchy of birth. Status, not manhood, counted. Surely it is significant that the very institution with which are associated such consultative decisions as India knows is the 'brotherhood' 'baradari' which, letter for letter, is identical with the old Greek 'phratriæ' which Cleisthenes displaced. Democracy as we know it rests upon a lively sense of the people's rights: a recognition that the state is over all and for all, and that all must at times sink their individual welfare in the welfare of the whole. How far Christianity has come in to strengthen and spiritualize the associations of neighbourhood I need do no more than surmise. I do not think this assembly is likely to under-rate its power. But in India caste remains the dominant factor: it segregates and secludes men in a way of which the West has no conception; and it almost forces men to think as partisans and not as citizens, to regard themselves as members primarily of a body that is short of the whole. And I suppose that the Hindu doctrine of Karma, with its stress upon the importance of each man's attaining spiritual salvation through the exact discharge of religious duties, is a reinforcing impulse rather than a solvent.

Nor have our administration and our institutions done much to call the territorial interest which is the matrix of democracy into play. Much of what I said of the Moguls is true of British administration. It took over the centralized system which it found in being and developed and perfected it. In every district it placed a trained British officer with Indian lieutenants,

to whom every aggrieved person could appeal for assistance or redress. It differed in spirit from, but in form it somewhat resembled, a military administration. Over the local officer, the deputy : over the deputy, the collector : over the collector, the Commander : over the Commander, the Lieut.-Governor or Governor : over him, the Government of India : and over all, like far-off deities, the Secretary of State and Parliament.

It is true that the beginnings of local self-governing institutions were laid by Lord Ripon's Government in the 'sixties. Town councils, partly nominated partly elective, were set up in the towns : district councils in the rural areas. But the district officials remained the chairmen, and Government officers remained the executive agency of the boards. The desire to see things decently done prevailed over the desire to see Indians beginning to learn to do them : and the boards were not greatly encouraged to go their own way and to learn through their own mistakes. Before we pass judgment upon that piece of short-sightedness, if such it was, let us remember the inexperience and ignorance of those whose co-operation was invited, the serious consequences of mistakes or neglect in such a disease-ridden country, and the immense pressure of a vast volume of immediate work upon a little band of a few hundred British officers which left them small time or leisure to lift up their eyes to any distant vision of the future.

What we did therefore was to impose our methods of administration on India not in virtue of any mandate from the Indian people, but as agents of the real sovereign, the British people. But if the machine was autocratic, it was driven by a distant democratic motor : and many of the ideals of Western democracy have found their way into the administration. We rejected much of the old law of India with its tests and methods of punishment that were

repugnant to our ideas. It is true that we left the Indian his personal law—of marriage, succession, and inheritance ; and to this day the law in these respects is a law of status and not of territory. Indeed while we reformed and simplified the penal law we bent so far to Indian opinion as to make penal certain acts against marriage and religion which the West would treat only as a civil wrong. But it was the conscience of the West not of the East that abolished *sati* (the burning of widows), and forbade infanticide and other barbarous practices and the marriage of children of tender years. And it is the ideas of the West—perhaps the result of the humanitarian movement which began with the Wesleys and led to the abolition of the slave trade—that have inspired the struggle with famine and disease, and the attempt to do something for the depressed classes. Our critics tell us we have done very little. Relatively, that is true. Had we had thrice the men, and had India been a richer country we would have done thrice as much. But at least we have awakened in educated Indians the desire that more should be done and that they should do it for themselves.

It may surely be claimed that apart from any constitutional growth the English administration has brought India some of the fruits of democracy. The British official may be criticized for many things : but he has stood for justice between race and race, high caste and outcaste, rich and poor. He stands for a level of detachment, impartiality, uprightness, and efficiency which most reasonable Indian confess to be higher than their own. But though our rule may have won admiration it has not won affection. Even before the stirrings of political growth occurred the Indian found our methods too precise and rigid for his looser ways. He sets far more store on appearances than we do, he has far less sense of the value of time or money ; and what is more, in consequence of his

social organization he has not the same sense of the public interest as we have. The whole does not exist for him ; the individual is everything. With the professional administrator it may be too much the other way. This I think is why the Indian is so often on the side of the offender. The wrong to the State means little to him : the prospect of a man being sent to imprisonment or transportation fills him with vivid regret. He sympathizes with the man who is fined for a neglect of sanitary precautions rather than with the neighbour whose child has died in consequence. I would not appear to speak by way of criticism. I could dwell on some gifts which the Indian has for public business, and in which he excels us—his patience, his tact, his ingenuity, his grasp of minute detail. But in the qualities which spring from a sense of the well-being of the whole he is inevitably behind the Western. He cannot be blamed for it. He has not been through the development which has called them forth.

Now if it so far should seem to you that the claim that our officers have stood for democracy and its ideals in the East is based on somewhat slender grounds, I come to the two things which surely make it abundantly good. We have educated the Indian in the highest that we knew ourselves. We asked ourselves what was the best we could give him, and we found it in the writings of our own great teachers, philosophers, publicists, historians, poets. Doubtless we did not fully foresee how the lesson would come home. I do not believe for a moment that we should have been deterred if we had. So we put into his hands the story of the struggle for popular rights in Britain ; we told him how the English people rose and beheaded one king and drove out another : how Britain stood forth as defender of the liberties of Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries ; and how a succession of reform bills had enlarged the franchise until practi-

cally all the people of the country had a voice in its affairs. The moral of the story was unmistakable. Autocracy whether at home or abroad was exhibited as an evil to be opposed and got rid of. The ideal was of freedom slowly broadening down till the government of the people by the people for the people was attained. It was inevitable that the mind of educated India should begin to ask itself—are these things which are good for the West, not good for the East as well? Is not even indifferent self-government a better thing for us than the best government by others? If patriotism and independence are virtues in Britain, and the Netherlands, and Italy, are they not virtues in India? Are we always to be denied an opportunity of practising the lessons which are presented to us? And we ought to rejoice that such questions are being asked.

It is only of recent years with the growth of education, the greater knowledge of the external world, the example of Japan, and above all, the world-shaking events of the war, that the challenge has made itself loudly and widely heard. Events have moved far faster than our provision for them: but that may be said of many people besides the Indian Government. Sixty years ago we began the process of associating a few selected Indians with the Councils that made the laws; in the nineties the number of Indian members was increased, and the principle of election by such constituencies as it then seemed possible to construct was introduced; eleven years ago the number of Indian members in the legislatures was increased up to the point at which their advice or criticism had full play, but the Government could in the last resort secure the passage of its measures. But although Indian members were appointed also to the executive, the executive remained without accountability to the legislature; and the criticism of Government policy remained

uninfluenced by any sense of responsibility such as is imposed by the prospect before a parliamentary opposition of having to assume office and to execute the measures it advocates. The voice of criticism without the Councils blended with a certain feeling of artificiality and irritation within the Councils which such a position created.

This was the situation which Mr Montagu and Lord Chelmsford have attempted to meet. They concluded that India could only follow in the footsteps of the West ; and that if she was to advance at all, some measure of responsibility must be imposed on Indian ministers and members and electorates. But they recognized also that by reason of her lack of education, her profound inexperience in public affairs, and her grievous divisions among castes and creeds, India was as yet unripe for complete responsibility. The people of these islands, through Parliament and their officers in India, must still secure the stability and peace of the country, and remain for a time in charge of those matters over which control could not without disaster be surrendered. This led them to what has been called dyarchy, the division of the Government into two main spheres, one eventually Indian, one eventually official. I will not go into the more complex details. But looked at broadly their scheme is just this—an attempt to blend a Western system of government with the only system which the East has hitherto known ; to mingle democracy and autocracy : the methods of the twentieth century in Great Britain with those of the sixteenth.

It is a colossal and daring experiment the like of which has not been seen in the world before. Let us wish it well. But how difficult the Indian people found it to begin to act as a nation will be seen from what occurred in the search for an electorate to choose the new Councils. What I have called the tribal principle showed at once

that its strength was unimpaired. The Mohammedans refused to vote in open constituencies with the Hindus, and demanded their own electoral roll and their own candidate. So did the Sikhs, the Indian Christians, and the Anglo-Indians. So did even the non-Brahmin Hindus in Madras, though in this instance the Government felt unable to admit the claim fully. The principle of communal representation was also extended to other minorities like the landlords, the universities, and European and Indian commerce, in which its justification seems even harder. Let us think what this means. The great communities have been given each their quota of seats and the quotas are unalterable except by Parliament; none of the bodies of opinion which are natural to India can gain seats from one another, and no Redistribution Bill is possible; the voter is encouraged to think of himself less as a member of the body politic than of his particular sect. The further effects upon the operation of parties in the legislature, and on the relations of ministers to one another and to parties can only be conjectured. But evidently it must be considerable. India, that is to say, at the very outset of her Parliamentary growth, has clung tightly to an institution which, if we are right in our retrospect of Western political growth, is fundamentally out of keeping with Parliamentary methods. I do not say that anything else was practically possible; still less do I suggest that the adherence to caste divisions was a fatal obstacle against what we have done. We can only steer in what we believe the right direction, and make such sail as we can at the outset. But I do suggest that the factor of social disintegration is likely to modify profoundly the course of Indian political development; and I do conjecture that India in the near future is going to present an extraordinarily interesting study to all observers of the growth of institutions. I hope that observers and

recorders will be forthcoming, for a new chapter of constitutional history is to be written. We can see, of course, how the mere exercise of the rights of citizenship may call forth the wider interests of truly national life, and how the interplay of politics may, as has elsewhere happened, soften the edges of social cleavages. But it would be rash to assume that the immemorial strongholds of caste and creed will fall easily. At the moment the extreme section of the nationalists are tinged with reaction. They are crying out not merely for complete and immediate self-government, not merely for the immediate disappearance of the Western official, but for the obliteration of most that he has brought with him—law courts, state schools, hospitals, railways, factories. This is not the saner voice of India, and it seems bound to spend itself vainly upon the logic of facts; but it is a factor that we have to take account of—and indeed it may be that we should be thankful for it, inasmuch as the need for resisting such a policy of sheer negation may help moderate Indians and officials in their very difficult task of keeping step together.

Very much is going to depend on the men we get in India in the near future. The old order changeth, yielding place to new; and the career of the public servant will no longer carry the old attractions of individual responsibility and wide discretion. But there will be more need than ever of men who will give their lives to India in what we may call the missionary spirit, not caring overmuch if their lines are to be cast in easy or pleasant places, but desiring intensely to help a perplexed and growing people to the stature of full maturity. A thoughtful and sober-minded Indian writing in December last said: "We are still a theocratically-minded people," and this saying may illustrate the magnitude and the difficulty of the work before us. No one can promise that a Service career in India will be comfortable or well-paid or

successful ; it seems likely that there will be many irritations and disappointments ; in many ways perhaps a slipping back, and the loss of things we value. But if it be true that a nation can only grow by trying, then we are right to let India try ; and for anyone who feels that he will be content at his life's end to have assisted a little in the making of a nation, there is good work calling in India.

# THE CONTACTS OF THE WEST WITH ASIA AND AFRICA

## (3) SOCIAL CONTACTS BETWEEN RACES

Rev. FRANK LENWOOD, London Missionary Society

THERE may be other subjects *as* important, but I doubt whether there are any subjects *more* important than that of race and the complications it causes in the modern world. The enormous increase in communications in the last fifty years (which shows no sign of abating its activity) forces us to discover where we stand. I am inclined to think that good social relations are more important than political justice. People who are treated with personal respect are often very patient under alien control, while on the other hand this gift of power is nullified, if its receivers know that they are despised.

(1) *It is fatally easy to get a wrong view.* The roots of the error may be traced far into the past. In the first stages of human barbarism, strangers were always unwelcome at the camp-fires. While existence was on a plane hardly above the animal, survival was a matter of struggle, and each new approach might be an attack. In varying degrees the same temper has persisted down the centuries, though speaking generally, its influence has steadily grown less. The stock-in-trade, for instance, of certain political agitators of to-day is a frantic insistence on the prosperity of another race. They wish to suggest that if others prosper, we must lose. It is the same theory of struggle.

But there is also that frequent combination of indolence and cowardice which goes to make convention. If you are to meet with other races you must break away to some degree from your established habits. For a time you will not know where you are. In such a position, the shrinking, sluggish, coward soul is afraid. It is so much easier and safer to follow the herd instinct and to jib at every superficial difference. We have to face the fact that these causes are strong. I do not wonder that we, most of us, find much race feeling in our own natures. Race feeling is as natural as original sin.

It becomes worse when it is reinforced by theories of white dominance. I believe those theories are almost always vamped up to justify an attitude of prejudice or of pure selfishness, and to excuse very much that will not bear a careful impartial gaze.

(2) *The results are fatal.* (That is why we said that the wrong view was "fatally" easy.) The world just now is shaking from end to end with the hot, uncontrolled passion of race antagonism. No matter where we turn we find the same thing. Chinese students are in arms about the Shantung settlement. Egypt and Syria are alike unsettled. The Philippines are asking that the Americans should withdraw.

We are so used to a world in disorder that it is worth while to face in more detail what such unrest really amounts to.

Take India. There, as you know, the policy of non-co-operation has been adopted. It involves tremendous sacrifice and even more tremendous danger. The policy may quite well make government impossible. Indeed that is its intention. I take up a casual letter from a little village usually deep-sheltered from the gusts of popular passion.

" . . . Non-co-operation is spreading furiously

throughout India. Even here in K——, many are refusing to pay taxes, and to-day I saw the bazaar enlivened by schoolboys on strike. Their reason was that the Headmaster had exercised his power to vote yesterday. They refuse to return to school until he is dismissed or withdraws his vote! Only 4 out of 600 voters had the courage to vote, I am told, and those four poor men are being sadly boycotted. One is a Moslem, and anyone salaaming him will be fined a rupee. *Banias* (shopkeepers), are forbidden to serve the schoolmaster. . . ."

Set over against that letter, as its contrast and its cause, the fact that on any boat going out to India you will meet a large majority of people—people very much like ourselves—who believe that the Indians "must be kept in their place," who bitterly resent the doctrines of Indian development put forward by Sir William Marris yesterday, and who even at their best accept without hesitation all manner of personal advantage which is given to them as members of the ruling race, and to them alone. Set over against that letter the further fact that Indians to-day find it hard to get passages to India because of their race, and are sometimes refused rooms at English hotels. The latter happened the other day at four hotels to one of the best-known Indians at this Conference!

Or turn to Africa. Hitherto the negroes of Africa have been puzzled and sometimes sullen, but quiet, and as the white man would say, easy to manage. Now those who know will tell you that from the Cape for a long way northward, the black and coloured populations are simmering with angry discontent. Colonel Pritchard, Director of Native Labour in South Africa, wrote recently in relation to the low grade mine and the conditions of native labour: "Unless appropriate remedial measures are taken, it is my belief that the time is not far off when even a standing army would be unable to keep at work

the mass of the workers." If that is the judgment of a European official, what are the natives saying themselves? In Rhodesia the Chartered Company has tried to claim every acre of the land without any reference to the Matabele who previously lived upon it. Is it likely that they will be content? Unhappily, the Labour Party is not exempt from race prejudice. Their record in South Africa is by no means clean in regard to the black and "coloured" races, though the "coloured" people are, of course, on one side the offspring of white men. The position in regard to the immigration to this country of negroes and Asiatics is complicated, but it is unfortunate that in certain cases the Labour Party should base its opposition, not upon the lowness of economic standard, but upon the mere prejudice of colour.

I could multiply these instances a hundred times over from every part of the world. It is impossible to exaggerate the universal inflammation from which the nations suffer. Unless there be a change, it is by no means unlikely that some of those of you who sit here will suffer in your own bodies for the sins of our own race.

Indeed, I do not see how our race can help but suffer. There are already in the British Empire some 350 million people of colour against about 80 million white people. Most of the coloured stocks have a racial fertility which seems to be denied to us. Twenty per cent. of the population, and that a decreasing percentage, cannot continue to hold down the rest against their will. The productiveness of large areas of the world depends, we must remember, on the willing co-operation of native labour.

But even if we could look forward to maintaining the conditions as they exist to-day, the danger to our own race would still be very grave. There is no vice like contempt. Just as mercy blesses him that gives and him that takes, so contempt poisons him who gives it lodg-

ment in his soul, while it degrades its victim. You who are students know what contempt means in the student community. The man who is looked down upon—how little he gets out of college! How much the college suffers! It is the same in the larger world. Unless we escape from some of the most characteristic tempers of to-day, there is nothing for it but mutual destruction.

Here is a fragment of a litany written by a man of colour after a lynching of several negroes :—

“ Bewildered we are and passion tossed, mad with the madness of a mobbed and mocked and murdered people : . . . we raise our shackled hands and charge thee . . . Keep not thou silent, O God !

“ Sit no longer blind, Lord God, deaf to our prayer, and dumb to our dumb suffering. Surely Thou, too, art not white, O Lord. . . .”

Do you remember at the end of Browning’s “ *Instans Tyrannus* ” how the tyrant speaks :—

“ Do you see ? just the vengeance complete,  
The man sprang to his feet,  
Stood erect, caught at God’s skirts and prayed !  
So, I was afraid.”

So, when I think of those words, “ *Surely Thou, too, art not white, O Lord,* ” I am afraid for Europe and my people, for I seem to see the hands of black men everywhere lifted up to God, and I know that for every sin against them judgment is sure.

(3) In what I have said I know I have been making a great assumption. I have assumed that *the only tolerable view of human beings is God’s view*. Man is the son of God. This man is worth in His sight as much as the other. Indeed, the New Testament seems to go further. The parable of the lost sheep would suggest that the one in danger counts for more than the ninety-and-nine who are not. The good Samaritan teaches the same lesson, that

in the view of Jesus there was a peculiar link between all men of goodwill and those requiring their help. Man is the son of God, and the more needy, the more truly son.

Like all great central truths, this truth is incapable of proof to those who do not see that brotherhood follows from our own sonship. But we can get useful support by asking what are the alternatives.

The alternative that really matters is the doctrine of a permanent superiority of the white races and a permanent inferiority of the rest. Is such a doctrine historically probable? All the superior races of the past have lost their mastery. The dominions of Egypt, Assyria, Rome, the Moors, have faded away. Is our clay so different in essence that our dominion cannot fade? Is our superiority so unrelated to character that whether good or bad, whether faithful to our trust or unfaithful, we shall still remain superior?

Or again one asks, is the theory of permanent superiority conceivable intellectually? The men who go out as doctors to China to-day must be of high rank if they are to hold their own with Chinese of Western training.

The European missionary to certain parts of India must be a man of ability, if he is to add much to the strength of the Indian workers. Or let me go to quarters less obvious. I have here a book, of which the English is such as few can write for purity and colour. Its thought on political problems is profound. All its spirit I cannot accept, but on many of its pages I should be proud to call the man who writes it master. He is a man of colour, in part of negro blood, W. E. Burghardt du Bois, and the book is "Darkwater." From it I took the litany I have quoted. It passes my comprehension how the race that can produce such a man can be regarded as permanently inferior.

The fact is that all the processes of the world are going the other way. Inferiority is being levelled up and superiority disappears. Even with the races of the humblest origin you can see the advance.

I take it that most of you do not belong to any kind of ancient nobility. If I do, my ancestors have very carefully concealed the fact. Centuries back you and I would have been regarded as people born to be inferiors and doomed to remain so by a natural law. That should teach us not to make the same mediæval mistake in relation to other races. No, the doctrine of permanent inferiority is one we can accept as little for others as for ourselves.

But some one may say, "We admit that they are not permanently inferior, but they are inferior now." Now there are classes and societies of whom any such thought is ridiculous. The white races which have made the world-muddle of the last seven years, and have prepared for it so diligently, are in no position to brag too much about superiority. But in the case of some of the less-developed races I am quite willing to admit that they are inferior. Still that doesn't settle the question. Everything turns on which half of your judgment you are going to emphasize—the present inferiority or the ultimate worth that comes to them because they are sons of God. This is not an academic question. If we believe that they are capable of it, we are bound to try and raise them. We have to help their evolution. If we are not helping we are hindering. Our indifference may be the stumbling-block for the feet of Christ's little ones.

There is a third alternative, that is, leaving on one side the question of superior and inferior, we should keep the races permanently apart. To certain humane but prejudiced minds this seems an attractive solution. But it will not do. The world is too small, communication

too effective, and our economic interdependence too great, to allow of such permanent segregation. We need one another, too, for the moral gifts that each can give to the other. Even a simple race like the Papuan has its simplicity to bring as a gift to the Kingdom of God. We cannot isolate the races. God's view of man is the only tolerable view.

(4) The acceptance of God's view commits us to courses which are not commonly pursued to-day. Many of you will agree. But I hope you will not agree too lightly, for you have yet to stand the test. There is hardly any sphere of life in which there is so radical a difference between him that putteth on his harness and him that taketh it off. If five years hence you are living out the lessons this Conference has taught you, that, and not present acclamation, will be the proof of real results.

(a) We have to change many of our standards of value. Many of our conventions based on our own latent pride have got to go. We must value all political and social questions in human terms. At present many of our estimates are entirely false. We must begin with our own countrymen. Britain would play a very different part in the making of world brotherhood if we conquered our own class distinctions. In essence the problem is the same in every land. The true friend of his own race, especially the friend of those whom opportunity visits late and with limping feet, will also be the friend of other races. The snob in this country will make a poor official abroad and an unspeakable missionary. Such of the Labour movements as allow themselves to be swayed by race hostility are untrue to the democratic name they bear. The dignity of man as man is the foundation of all true democracy, and the men who

betray that dignity will find the betrayal recoiling upon themselves.

So much is said to free our hands. They are too often tied abroad by sins at home. For in Africa and the East *the need for new values is a growing need*. We set up our Anglo-Saxon standards—often our public school standards—as if they were divine. Isaiah did without most of the apparatus that we know to-day, so did Plato and Julius Cæsar and Paul and the architects of the Acropolis. A good life is a bigger thing than any civilization of the West. I do not think it is true that the East is spiritual and the West material. They have each their spirituality to give, and without a shadow of doubt, each their materialism to conquer. But let us recognize the essential wisdom of other types of society and cease to look down on foreign ways.

(b) We must cultivate *a very sensitive imagination*. The imagination of others' feelings is one of the rarest gifts, yet for want of it infinite harm has been done. We must learn instinctively to see every situation as other races see it; to know what they desire, to understand why they are repelled. Let us avoid accepting privileges given to us because we belong to a ruling caste, but denied to the real inhabitants of the country. At least, we need not forget to be gentlemen.

And, as I speak here, I should like to ask the brown and black races in their dealing with weaker, more primitive peoples, to grant the same sympathy and comradeship that they demand from us. The words of Jesus were true—"With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

(c) We must train ourselves to a *peculiar generosity, chivalry and tenderness* towards those who have

suffered at the hands of a non-Christian society. They do not ask condescension from us—the demand is really much more for our own sakes than for theirs ; but by our faithfulness will our country and our religion be judged.

(d) *We must learn from them.* Believe me, there is much that we have to learn. It is not always pleasant to realize our mistakes, but we gain more from those who approach problems from a different angle, and do not accept our point of view, than from those whose agreement is monotonous and almost servile. And we must give our friends their fair chance of initiative in friendship. We must not wish to keep all its leadership in our own hands. It is the only way to avoid patronizing.

(e) *We must embody our belief to the full in social intercourse.* Whether in India or Africa, in Cambridge or Bristol, let us make friends of men of the other races. Nothing less than this will meet the case. To be sympathetic in opinion is of very little value if we do not show our brotherhood in act. And here, ready to hand among the foreign students around us, we have a chance, a chance such as in this life most of us will never see again. I don't say it will be easy. You have natural and unnatural suspicions to break down. At times you will be disappointed by foreigners as by those of your own race. But there is no service more worthy of the Master whose name we bear.

Or again in India or China you will normally find that the society into which you enter expects you to have only formal relations with the people. The club is for Europeans ; the club is the centre and the standard. You men and women who want to follow Christ will have to rise above the club, and

believe me, you will find it terribly hard. When you've done it, you'll still find the hardest part of your task before you ; the positive creation of friendship with the people of the land. But all hope of a new world depends on the loyalty of your attempt. Even for this Christ can give you the power.

There are some Churches where men of colour are not allowed to worship with their white brethren in Christ. Even the Communion is sometimes made an occasion for dividing those of the same Church along the cleavage of race. To mention this is all that is needed for its condemnation.

But there are among you women who will go out to marry men abroad. Do not let your man shut you off from the people of the country, under the idea that he is sheltering you from unpleasantness or hardship. It is often done, but it is a mistake that accounts for much of the *ennui* and barrenness of the life of the European women in the East. On the other hand, European women might do inestimable service in helping their Eastern sisters, and they would find that their sympathy was valued in a way that would surprise them. More than the men they could be the reconcilers of the peoples.

Or perhaps you are going out as missionaries. "For the missionary it will be easy." Oh, will it? It would, I suppose, if we were all living in close fellowship with our Lord, but that is a very exacting test! Most of us admit that we fall far below the love of Jesus. It is easy to be repelled by racial differences, to be swayed unconsciously by the opinion of other Europeans, and to acquiesce in what one observer has called a "white Christianity." It is easy, but it will be the ruin of our work.

Mr Oldham has pointed out that it is easy for a

Christian to be so absorbed in the things he is doing that he ceases to be a man and becomes a personalized catalogue of operations. In countries like India such a want of spiritual margin rests upon a double fallacy. First, the East will not be won by work, but by a spirit—a spirit like that of our Lord. Second, the production of spiritual leadership is only possible to the men of leisure. We complain of the lack of Indian leaders; the fact is we have often been too busy to help in their inspiration.

And so we come back to the importance of friendship; we must have it at all costs. Are these things visionary and sentimental? The real sentimentalism seem to me to be in this talk of race superiority. God's view of man is the only common sense, the only statesmanship. The men of international mind are the real statesmen, and of them the country is ultimately proud. They lose their life, they live for and in others, and so they save it. Such men are not weak men, but the heroes of their race.

I have had the privilege of serving with and under Indians. I do not say they have never made mistakes: they have—just as have Europeans; but they have given to me with a princely open-handedness, which reminds me of the ungrudging giving Jesus loved. And so I say, for the happiness of your own career, be sure that you make friends.

Friendship is a wonderful thing with men of our race. But there is a rare beauty in friendship with men of another race. I know it with Germans. I know it with Indians. For Christ is never so clearly set forth as Lord, never so truly glorified as when the great gulfs are bridged, and two men of far-off lands and different history are friends in Him.

## THE CONTACTS OF THE WEST WITH ASIA AND AFRICA

### (4) THE MISSIONARY AND THE GROWING CHURCH

WILLIAM PATON, Missionary Secretary,  
Student Christian Movement

WE have been discussing different elements in the contact of East and West—the work of government, the function of commerce and of the professions, the relations between the races which are being brought day by day into closer touch with one another. We have now to look at a fourth factor, the missionary, and to try to understand his place in the world to-day.

It is a very important place that he fills. There is no one who is more regularly the butt of smoking-room wit and ignorant prejudice, and no one whose work is more honoured by those who know it best. To few men and women does it fall to be so heartily cursed and sneered at by their opponents and so fervently praised by their friends, as it does to the missionary. The reason for this is that the missionary in Africa and the East is on a different errand from others, and is judged by a different standard, a standard which he has chosen for himself. He comes out of the Christianity of the Western nations, and his mission to the lands to which he goes is to spread Christianity. Amid all the varied impulses which go forth from West to East, good and bad, altruistic and selfish, there is none which in essence and idea is so unselfish as this.

At its best, the missionary's work is the most reconciling force in all the world of nations and races. It represents some of the noblest and deepest sentiments of Western life and thought, and it can do and has done much to mitigate the harmful effects of inter-racial contact, and to point the way to a better order of life.

What is the reason for the missionary's existence? There is only one answer to this question, and it is an answer which comes out of the heart of Christianity. Wherever in the whole history of Christendom Christians have been alive and quick, not resting in traditional ways, but genuinely possessed by the spirit of their Master, there has been the missionary impulse. The religion of Christ is essentially one for which racial and national barriers have no meaning. If it is anything at all, it is for all mankind. When men are the possessors of a vital experience of Jesus Christ, they cannot keep it to themselves, they cannot rest content while others know nothing of it. The thing is priceless, and they feel that the world needs it. Moreover, they know that the Man they have come to love loves all the world, and that He can only express Himself through them and people like them.

It is in this simple but profound Christian conviction that the missionary enterprise is founded, and it cannot be properly appreciated unless this is understood. Sometimes, it is true, the sending out of missionaries is defended and advocated on lower grounds than these; because they will increase the influence of their own country in foreign lands, stimulate commerce or help to avert disastrous economic competition. But none of these things really have anything to do with the missionary motive or the missionary's work. From the days of St Paul, through those of Boniface, Xavier, Carey, and Duff to our own, the backbone of the missionary enterprise has been, "The love of Christ constraineth us,"

Evangelism, then, the carrying of the Gospel, is the first duty of the missionary and the first reason for his existence. But having said that, we need to look again at the meaning of the Gospel, and realize what is bound up with it. Evangelism does not merely mean preaching. What a Christian wants is that by every means Christ should be presented to men, and they be led to understand His spirit. Therefore, missionary work has always included both education and medicine within its scope, and is rapidly coming to include economic measures of different kinds for the amelioration of physical and material need. We believe that education is an essential part of the whole process of presenting Christ, and that mere preaching is very little use without it. So you find in all parts of the world the missionary school and college. In the same way the missionary doctor is showing the Christian spirit in his endeavours to relieve suffering and spread better ideas in regard to sanitation and public health. All these things are not baits to attract men to the Gospel, they are a part of the Gospel, they are ways in which the spirit of Christ can be expressed among men.

We have seen that the "missionary" idea—the giving of what you have—is essential to Christianity. There is another idea which is not less fundamental, and which affects our whole conception of missionary work, namely the idea of the Church. You can never separate Christianity from the thought of fellowship, of society, and the Christian life is a life lived with others in the power of a common spirit. Preaching is useful in its place, but Christianity spreads by contagion, and it is by the strength of the life that is in it that the Christian society grows. This means that while the sending out of the missionary to preach and teach and heal is an act of the highest importance, and one which the Church in the West owes it to its Master to perform, it is only the

beginning. No amount of missionaries will convert the world, simply because India, China, Japan, and Africa must see and hear the Christian word and spirit spoken and enshrined in Indian lives, by Chinese voices, in the common fellowship of Africans themselves.

It is therefore easy to see that the growth of the Church in the lands to which missionaries go is a matter of fundamental importance for the missionary and for all who want to understand missionary work. The mission and the missionary are, in principle, temporary and transitory, it is the indigenous Church that is permanent. On the long view, the missionary activity which counts is that which most helps in the upbuilding of a stable, self-directing Church. Success of any other kind is of very little value. There are a great many things that missionaries can do by themselves, in education, medicine, production of literature and preaching the Gospel, but the greatest service they render the lands to which they go is in the raising up of the Church, to be its own witness and do its own work.

Now the fact is that there is to-day in India, in China, in Japan, and in Africa, a very large number of Christians. In a sense, it is possible to say that the task of founding the Church in the mission field is accomplished. True there are great areas where the Gospel has never been preached, great areas where there are few Christians or none at all, great areas where most of the Christians are poor and weak and illiterate. But there are also Christian communities with a high measure of education and a developed thought and life of their own. There are Christian leaders in India, China, and Japan, at least equal in devotion and ability to any missionary, men who occupy positions of high responsibility in both Church and State. The Church is in being. The work lying before it is gigantic, it is in many respects ill-equipped for it, but it

is there, and it is growing more and more conscious of itself and its mission.

When this stage has been reached, and indeed long before it has been reached, the missionary has to re-think his position. He may have got into the way of thinking, as certainly multitudes of his supporters in the West do think, of the work of spreading the Christian faith as *his* work, done by him with the help of "native agents." He has to realize, as in all lands missionaries do realize to-day, that he is a partner in this work, and that the other partner is the Church of the land. He has now to set himself to strengthen in every possible way the initiative, the self-expression, the life and power of the Church, to subordinate himself to it, to be its servant.

It is worth our while to spend a little time in tracing out more exactly the meaning in practice of this general principle, for there is no doubt that to a great many educated Indian, Chinese, Japanese and, it may be added, African Christians, the relation of the missionary to the growing Church is one of the burning questions of the day. It is easy to say that the function of the missionary is to serve and help the growing Church, but it is a much more difficult thing to realize in action all that is implied in this simple principle, especially when we remember the complications, prejudices, and obstacles which are the legacy of the past to the present. Let me briefly indicate some of the practical issues.

One big difficulty which we, who are British, have to face is that, in the majority of cases, a British missionary is a member of the ruling race in the country where he is working. This is not true in China or in Japan, but it is true in India, in many parts of Africa, and in certain other regions. I am not going to say anything here on the question of government; that has been dealt with elsewhere in this Conference. But I do wish to point

out the fact, undeniable as it seems to me, that in some ways it is a very real handicap to the missionary to belong to a ruling race, and that it is also a source of great danger to his own religious life. It is a handicap, because we are living in a world where the spirit of national independence runs high, and to some extent every Britisher, missionary or not, is regarded in India, for instance, as part and parcel of the governing machine. While this is quite a real initial obstacle, it is one which can be got over, and it is not nearly so serious as the other danger to which I have referred, the danger to a man's or woman's own inner life. It is an amazingly easy thing, in a land where the white man and perhaps the Britisher especially has great power and great prestige, to allow the mood and temper of the governing class to become one's own. Probably all of us here are quite certain that we should not yield to any such temptation. You do not know unless you have tried. There are few spiritual dangers more insidious. Consider the fact, unpalatable as it may be, that in India and in Egypt (to take two countries where national feeling is fully articulate) a great many of the leading and most respected Christians hold that the average missionary has not escaped this danger, and that when a crisis comes where the interests (or the apparent interests) of India or Egypt and Britain diverge, he will infallibly be found on the side of Britain. (I have stated the case with extreme moderation, because I am anxious to avoid the appearance of exaggeration in a matter where it is very easy to exaggerate.) They will cordially admit the notable exceptions, but they feel that they *are* exceptions. Public affairs, however, are not the most important sphere where this spirit is liable to be shown. If you live in a country where a certain habit and demeanour of superiority has become almost ingrained in the white man because he and his race are in power, you will find

it a surprisingly difficult thing to escape that habit and demeanour. I am not speaking as a critic, for no one is more conscious of failure in this regard than I am. The problem is so urgent that plain speaking is needed ; we do not want to live in a fool's paradise.

Consider another point. The Church in the mission field, nearly everywhere, is poor, and compared with it, the mission is rich. The pay of a missionary compared with that of other white men living abroad in the professions, in commerce, or in Government service, is very small, but, compared with the resources of the average Indian Christian, it is large. Only the practice of great simplicity in life will enable the missionary to overcome the barrier to brotherly fellowship and intercourse which a great difference in standard of living is apt to cause. But this personal problem is not the whole of the matter. A great many missionaries are in the position of paymasters to quite a considerable proportion of their flocks, and it is not the easiest thing in the world for brotherly service to be combined with the functions of the paymaster. The reason for this situation is simply this, that while the contributions of the people themselves to the support of the work are steadily increasing, they are much smaller than the contribution of the mission, and that, with exceptions (which also are increasing), the control of the Western money is in the hands of individuals (or councils) who are also Western. This system grew up ; probably it was never definitely thought out as a whole, but the result has been to create an environment for both missionary and Indian which is almost necessarily fatal to the spirit of equality and brotherhood. The effects of this can be seen everywhere. It is true in individual relations, and it is true when Indian Christianity and the missionary movement as a whole confront one another. The ablest Christians feel that the policy which the

Christian movement in their country as a whole is following is one in which they have had very little share. They do not misunderstand the motives which prompted the generosity of Western Christians, but they feel that it was never intended, and in any case is totally wrong, that the Indian voice should only be heard in council in rough proportion to the amount of money which Indians contribute.

The time has come for a much larger delegation of authority to properly constituted Church courts, including the control of funds contributed in the West, and of the missionaries themselves. Somehow or other we have to convince the Christians of these lands that we are genuinely desirous of brotherhood with them, that the exercise of authority, because we are from the West which sends the money, is distasteful to us, and that we want to work on terms of the completest equality with them. Into the technicalities of this matter I do not wish to enter here, but I am convinced that the need for action is urgent, and unless I misjudge utterly the temper and outlook of the present generation of those who are looking forward to missionary service, they desire nothing more than to be able to work as brothers, on equality with their brothers of the East, in the common service of the Church of the land.

On another problem, which arises in this same connection, I should like to touch very briefly. If the Church of the future in India or China is to serve India or China as it should, it must be truly Indian or truly Chinese in its thought, its organization, the language of devotion which it uses, the mode of the architecture of its buildings—in short, everything. Again, it is easy to say this, but much more difficult to achieve it, because we are all unconsciously moved by the traditions or even the prejudices in which we have been reared, and we can only divest

ourselves of these by a conscious effort. You would be astonished, probably, to see the degree to which Christian institutions, schools, churches, and colleges in the East are Western in their atmosphere ; how the organization of the Churches is copied from Western models ; how cut off from the currents of their own national life many of the finest Christians feel themselves to be. No one set out to accomplish this end, it came about almost by default ; that is to say, there was little conscious thought about the whole matter, and Western ways were gradually imposed on the growing Churches because nothing else was in the minds of those in authority. With the surging tide of Nationalism moving all through the East nowadays, it is of the very highest importance that any suspicion that Christianity is a Western thing which denationalizes those who touch it, should be avoided. In practice this means not that we should try to do this "nationalizing" work ourselves, but help the Indians or Chinese to do it themselves, clear the way for them and back their experiments.

"Why," it may be said, "do you lay so much emphasis upon the growing Church in what you have to say about the function of the missionary? Isn't all this rather an argument against the sending out of missionaries at all?" It is precisely this intimate relationship to the growing Church that ought to be the distinguishing thing about the missionary. His service of the Church, his subordination of himself to it, marks him off, defines his function, gives him a reason for his existence. If a man wants to take up education in the East, he can do it as a missionary, or he can do it through Government or in other ways. The same is true of medicine and other vocations. But if any man or woman wants to get close to this transcendently important question of the growing Church, here is the way to do it. I am very well aware of the volume of criticism in non-Christian lands directed against many

missionaries precisely because they do not fulfil the function I have outlined. It only makes clearer than ever that this is the true way, and that there is no other. Nothing can exceed the warmth of the welcome which is extended to those missionaries who prove clearly that they are out at all costs to be the servants and brothers of the Christians in the lands to which they go.

It used to be the fashion to appeal to students to take up or prepare for world "leadership." It is an outworn idea, and never quite Christian. The younger branches of the Church Catholic call you, not to leadership, but to service. On their behalf I would make no indiscriminate appeal for thousands of missionaries, but I would put before you the life of a missionary as one of priceless and unique opportunity within that historic, ever-expanding fellowship of Christ's followers, through whom alone His spirit can transform the world.

## GOD THE SUPREME REALITY

J. H. OLDHAM

WE shall be engaged while we are here for a large part of our time in looking at the world in which we are living and in trying to understand some of the tasks that lie before our generation. But if that alone were the subject of our thoughts during these days, the Conference would not fulfil its purpose. So long as we stay within the circle of ourselves and our problems, our deepest need will not be met. What we need above all else is to find a power greater than the difficulties and problems we have to face and able to make us equal to our tasks. We need some mighty breaking forth of new energies if the walls of the prison-house of materialism in which we are living to-day are to be broken down, and in a world dominated by the pursuit of selfish ends we are to establish the reign of good-will and brotherhood. The vital question for this Conference is whether we can find new sources of power, which will lift us above our present selves, give us a new vision to be the inspiration of our lives, and send us out to serve the world in a strength that is not our own.

Let us at the beginning of our Conference recognise that that is an experience possible to all of us. For each of us there is within reach a fuller, richer life than we now know. For this small circumscribed life of ours has windows open to heaven. It has communications with the ocean of infinite being. We are made for God, and as

we live in Him we are joined to the eternal source of all energy, power and life.

Rabindranath Tagore, the Indian poet, in one of his recent poems compares the ordinary narrow shut-in life of man to a narrow lane overhung with buildings between which may be seen above like a ribbon a strip torn out of space. The lane sees the sun only for a few moments at midday and asks herself, Is it real? The spring breeze blows against the corners and fills the air with scraps of paper and rags, and the lane says, "What a fury of foolishness! Are the gods gone mad?" But the daily refuse from the houses never rouses her to question. She accepts every stone of her pavement, but when a blade of grass peeps up between her chinks she is baffled. How can solid facts permit such intrusion? In the morning when the touch of autumn light is on her houses she dreams for a moment of a limitless wonder somewhere beyond her buildings. But as the routine of the day begins—the maid returning from the market and the smell and smoke from the kitchens—it becomes clear that the real and normal consist solely of herself and her houses.

It is from this narrow, limited life that religion proposes to deliver men. Get that picture of the lane clearly in your mind and then set beside it this other picture from the Psalms of a man whose thoughts dwell continually with eternal truth and goodness and whose life is one of communion with God—"He shall be like a tree planted by the waterside, that will bring forth his fruit in due season: his leaf also shall not wither"—because through it flows the sap of the eternal divine life.

Let us fix in our minds this picture of the renewal of life through drinking at eternal springs. And let us add to it this further picture of a world in which God is a living reality. To minds drugged by the materialism of our age the words may sound strange. But they are not strange

but plain and natural if God be real and living. "In the wilderness shall waters break out and streams in the desert. And the glowing sand shall become a pool and the thirsty ground springs of water."

There is no more vital truth that you can lay hold of than this. Our resources and capacities to deal with a world full of problems are not limited and fixed. Our life is not like a small inland lake whose supply of water can be quickly exhausted. It has channels communicating with the ocean of infinite life. And just as we are not limited in ourselves, so also we are not limited by external circumstances. For that infinite life with which we are in touch is a creative energy powerful enough to transform the whole face of society. In proportion as we lay hold of this truth we begin to get a glimpse of what Christ meant when He said, "With God all things are possible."

I do not know what all of you in this hall think of Jesus Christ. But whatever view you take of Him, there are few here I imagine who will deny that no human life that has been lived on earth has exerted a profounder influence on human history and the lives of other men. What, then, was the secret of that unique life, the explanation of its undying power? There is no greater question than that in human history. And for those of us who worship Christ as divine, the question is of the same absorbing interest. When God incarnated Himself in a truly human life, what was the innermost nature and distinguishing quality of that life? To what kind of height did it raise this human nature of ours? If you search the records to discover the deepest secret of that life, you will never get deeper than this, you will never find a more satisfying explanation. The life of Jesus was a life lived in the unbroken consciousness of God. God was utterly and continually real to Him, more real than anything else. That was the secret of everything else. A

little more than thirty years so lived, and the whole course of human history has been changed and is being changed to-day.

That deepest secret of His own life He sought to communicate to His disciples. "Have faith in God" were His words to them. There is no greater word you can carry away from this Conference than that—"Have faith in God." There is no greater dynamic in all the world than a genuine and living faith in God.

If this Conference is going to mean anything at all, it will be because those of us who are here make decisions. Looking out on a world that has to be rebuilt, a world in which materialism, selfishness and men's dislike and hatred of one another threaten to spread ruin still farther, a world that can be saved only by the bursting forth of new forces of good-will, a new passion for justice, a new power of service, you will hear in your hearts the call to make a great choice.

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,  
In the strife of Truth with Falsehood, for the good or evil side."

Some of you, as the tasks that are waiting in the world are one by one laid before you may hear a call to serve God in some particular sphere and calling. But back of all these decisions, more important and fundamental than them all, is the decision whether you are going to face life and its tasks, its temptations and trials, alone or with God. Will you meet life in the poverty of your own resources or will you learn to draw on the inexhaustible resources of God? What is wrong with our life to-day is that it has become secular. It lacks depth. It lacks power. If society is to be saved we must get back to the eternal springs of life and power in God. In the daily round of practical activities our life wears thin. It tends to become nothing more than those

activities. Our life is just the things we do. It has no margins, no reserves. And such lives have not sufficient power to save the world. We need to recover depth, and we can do that only by going back to the eternal source of all things to renew our life, by opening our souls to the infinite life around us, by dwelling in the presence of God, Who is above all and in all and through all. A man becomes truly free only when, as a recent writer has said, he can "address his daily labour to God, build his houses to God and not to man, write his books to God, in the State serve his God only, love his God in the family, and fight against the (incarnate) devil and the devil alone."

This, I say, is the most important choice a man can make, the greatest and deepest question that concerns your little life and mine, which is ours for a few brief years, which is ours only that we may yield it up to God and find it again eternally with Him. Do you make the choice? If you do, what will it mean? It will mean, I believe, three things, all of them very simple, and yet all possessed of endless significance.

It will mean, first, that henceforth there will be in your life a sacred place reserved for worship; a time when you withdraw from the world and hold communion with God, Who is above the world; a time when you cease from your activities and rest and renew your soul in contemplation of the whole of things; a time when you correct your current standards by the light of eternal truth—the light that shines from the face of Jesus Christ; a time when in prayer you exchange the poverty of your own resources for the wealth of God's power and love, and so renew your strength that you will mount up with wings like eagles, will run and not be weary, walk and not faint.

I met in London, just as I was leaving for the Conference, my friend Professor Hogg of the Madras Christian

College. He gave me a copy of a little Meditation for daily use, which he has recently published through the Association Press in Calcutta. I should like to read you the opening paragraph, which is as follows :

“ Say to thy soul : ‘ Soul, wait awhile ! Enter not so heedlessly upon the daily round. Bethink thee, this is a day which it hath cost God long ages to fashion forth. He could not sooner have brought it to pass. For it had to grow out of yesterday—out of thy doings, and others’ doings, and His own thought and help and patience, throughout the hours that now are yesterday, and all through the days that went to make of yesterday what yesterday was. Wherefore this day, which seemeth to thee so like unto other days that thy acquired capacities and experience might suffice for competent discharge of its affairs, is indeed not like, but different. It is God’s newest handiwork, the fruit of His longest patience. Darest thou lay on it thy clumsy fingers, until first, in the quiet, His commission shall have sounded in thine ears afresh, and He shall have passed His promise to inspire thy weak endeavour ? ’ ”

What fools we are to mar and lose so many of our days by forgetting before we enter on them to engage in this transaction with God.

I know what a fight it will be for all of us to secure these times for worship. But the question is whether life has anything really worth while without them. Some time ago I had to consult a specialist, who gave me certain instructions. “ You will carry them out,” he said. “ I will do my best,” I replied, “ but it will be difficult to remember them in practice.” “ Remember them, my dear man,” he said, “ you have got to remember them, no matter how busy you are. Your whole future health depends on your practising them, the number of years you will be able to do your work. You have got to carry

them out, *coûte que coûte*, cost what it may." If God opens our eyes to see that in adjusting ourselves rightly to the ultimate nature of things, in opening our lives to His infinite life, is the true and only secret of strength and victory, then by His help, *coûte que coûte*, cost what it may, we shall make central and fundamental in our lives that without which they must remain poor and empty and weak and vain. That is the first thing: worship will be the centre and mainspring and inspiration of all our living.

Secondly, we have to go out from our times of worship back to the world to apply to all that meets us there the new knowledge we have gained of God and the new life we have received from Him. Just as certainly as without time for worship our life will become secular and shallow, so as surely, unless we bring our religion to bear on the whole of life, will that religion become sentimental and dreamy and unreal, or become a narrow and unattractive pietism. The weakness of religion to-day is due in no small degree to its failure to measure itself against the real problems of the modern world—the problems of industry and social life, of international and inter-racial relations. The object of our worship is to ally ourselves with God. But we shall discover the greatness and power of that with which we are allied only through the greatness and power of that which we are up against. Let us remember, therefore, that not only our times of worship but the very difficulty and impossibility of our tasks and the trials and circumstances which threaten to overwhelm are our opportunity of learning to know God. That was what St Paul meant when he spoke of taking pleasure in weaknesses and injuries and necessities, and when he declared that all things work together for good to them that love God.

In the third place, we must recognise that the de-

termination to relate our lives to God is a searching business. When God comes to us there are dark and hidden things in our lives that have to go. They cannot live in His presence. If God is allowed to have His way there may be a mighty upturning of many lives in this Conference. Let your own hearts answer if I speak true. All that is false in your life, all that is hollow and insincere, all that is impure, all that is selfish, all clinging to things that can never satisfy hearts that were made for God, for truth and honour and duty and high achievement, and the life of sons of Almighty God—all that must go.

If God is in our midst, if God is speaking to our hearts, there are some here who may experience a mighty conflict in their souls, as other men have had before them, between God and the things that shut God out. And because of this struggle, because when God comes into a man's life there are things which He cannot tolerate and which have to go, men have been afraid of God. It is the same old story, repeated from generation to generation. Like you and me, men have been afraid of God. And they have fled from Him. You remember how Francis Thompson describes this age-long story of the human heart :

" I fled Him down the nights and down the days ;  
I fled Him down the arches of the years ;  
I fled Him down the labyrinthine ways  
Of my own mind ; and in the midst of tears  
I hid from Him, and under running laughter."

And then at last the meaning of it all breaks on a man. " That voice is round me like a bursting sea." And this is what it says :

" Ah, fondest, blindest, weakest,  
I am He whom thou seekest ! "  
Thou dravest love from thee, who dravest Me."

When God wrestles with a man, it is love that wrestles

with him, love fighting against these evil and lesser things because they are the foes of man's best and highest and truest life. If God comes to you during these days and a struggle begins in your soul, remember it is love that is struggling with you, love that is seeking to set you free. That is God's main business with us here. He wants to make us free men and women, to set us free from our past, from the chains of destroying and weakening sin, from the tyranny of our lower selves, and to send us out free men and women to serve Him with gladness in His world. Do not let us be afraid of Him, but run to meet Him with open arms.

This brings us to the last main thought I wish to put before you, which will prepare us for what will be brought before us more fully on the following evenings of the Conference. The God of whom we have been speaking is God, the Creator of all things, the source of all life, infinitely greater than aught that our minds can conceive. But He is not a God whose nature is unknown, whose form and character are undefined and undefinable. He is the God whose character and heart are revealed in the person of Jesus Christ. The one thing that matters for each of us is that we relate ourselves rightly to God. But the vital question then is, What is the nature of the God to whom we relate ourselves?

The God whom Christ showed us is a God who has a purpose which He is seeking to realise in history! That purpose is to bring human life to its full realisation, to deliver men from their chains, to open their eyes to see the wonder and beauty and joy of God's world, to give them life in ever greater abundance, to unite them with one another in bonds of love and mutual service and to send them out as free sons of God to share in their Father's work in the world. As you look out on this world, full of rancour and antagonisms, of selfishness

and the oppression of men by their fellows, is there any greater power to bring about the transformation we desire than a new vision of what the life of men was meant to be? Suppose that all of us assembled here really believed in the depth of our souls that it is God's purpose always and everywhere to liberate men from their chains—the outward chains of oppression and the inward chains of their own weakness and sin—and to enable them to realise their full manhood and womanhood as His free children. Is there anything that would do more to save society than a passionate conviction born in the hearts of men and women here and spreading like contagion through the universities and colleges of our land that the object and meaning of life is not primarily to make money, or to make a career, but to co-operate with God in His work of making men, to help to open to our fellow-men everywhere the opportunity of a fuller, richer, more worthy life? To that service many of you desire to dedicate yourselves. When in the days to come the fight is hard and the forces against you seem irresistible, it is going to make all the difference to know that your cause is God's cause. It is not your ideals and dreams and aspirations with which you have to meet an indifferent world that mocks at them as sentimental and unreal. It is not your own will on which you have to rely to move the inertia of the world's materialism. No, the ultimate nature of things is on your side. The real forces of the world are working with you. The man who sees and lays hold of God's purpose, who allies himself with that purpose, is sure in his heart of victory. He cannot know defeat.

But to a Christian God is more than that. A nation is fortunate if, when it is involved in a struggle for its existence, it has at its head a leader who, by the loftiness of his purpose, his clear-sighted vision of the end and meaning of the conflict, and his unfaltering resolution,

inspires and sustains it in its day of trial. When such a great man appears in history, he may lift a whole people to new heights. The plain soldier, the common man draw strength and courage from the steadfastness of his purpose and the force of his will. In all this a great leader of men is but revealing glimpses of what God may be to men. But you may find in God not only what men find in a great human leader whose high thoughts are greater than their thoughts, and whose will communicates strength to their feebler wills, but also that more intimate and moving thing which is found in the officer who shares with his men every hardship of the march, and in an attack chooses for himself the place of greatest danger. It is to such a leader that men give their uttermost devotion. And the God we Christians worship is a God who has not remained outside this world in which we men sin and suffer and struggle, but has entered into the world of time and event, and consented to suffer at our hands. It is no accident that the Cross is the symbol of Christianity. It is the heart and centre of our faith. We ask ourselves that greatest of all questions, What is the real nature of the universe? What is the key to existence? What is God like? And the answer is the Cross. The passion of God for humanity. That is the secret of Christ's hold upon men. That is why in all ages and all lands and here in this hall after nineteen centuries men have found and still find the master motive and controlling passion of their lives in the words, "The love of Christ constraineth me." Such a leader we cannot desert. We could never forgive ourselves if we let Him down. His cause is our cause. A God who has thus revealed His heart we shall follow to the end. The life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself up for me.

St Paul drew an inference from that revelation of the

nature of God. "He that spared not His own Son," he said, "but gave Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him freely give us all things?" In saying that Paul was simply repeating the deepest thought of his Master. If you read the Gospels carefully you will find that the perpetual effort of Jesus was to get His disciples to believe that God delights to give good things to His children, that men may draw on Him freely for everything they need. To Jesus the supply was always greater than the need. What shall we say to that as a truth with which to face life? The world we are living in is full of difficulties. We are called to hard tasks. But in so far as we are Christians we shall not be Atlases staggering under a load of care, but children living in their Father's house. The religion of Jesus is a religion of joy, the joy that comes to those who know God to be more real than anything else, and who know therefore that the supply is always greater than the need.

What is it that you need? Forgiveness for your past? Take it. Deliverance from some sin that enchains you? Take it. Strength for a task that is too hard for you? Take it. It is all so simple that men cannot believe it to be true. Jesus could not get men to believe Him when He was on earth. He cannot get men to believe Him to-day. But that is the God in whom He believed and in whom He would have us believe.

You see what this life of dependence on an Almighty, ever-present, living, loving God to which Jesus calls us means. It means that as we go forth to face the world and its tasks our measure of what we may attempt and what may be accomplished is no longer what we can do but what God can do through us. The powers with which we are called to do our work are seen to be not our powers at all. They are the eternal truth and goodness and love which are at work in the world. All that is

asked of us is to participate in them, to be the vehicles through which they may do their work. Not we, but all that is divine in the world energising in us. "I live," wrote one who had found out this secret, "yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." It is a secret which saves us from all conceit and pride. So far from being tempted to boast of what we may accomplish, the wonder is that with such powers at our disposal we do not continually work miracles with them.

I have set before you to-night in all sincerity the faith by which I wish and try to live. I have spoken in halting words of things too great for human speech. And as I close, some of you may be saying, How do you know that God is like that? Give us some proof. I cannot give you a proof. I do not believe you can ever have a logical demonstration that God is what we have described Him to be. I believe there is only one thing we can do. We can try Him and see.

One of the strongest thinkers of our time has told us that "almost every forward step in the progress of life could be formulated as an act of faith—an act not warranted by knowledge—on the part of the pioneer who first made it." He goes on to point out by way of illustration how little there was in all that the wisest fish could know to justify the belief that there was more scope for existence on the earth than in the water or to show that living on land would lead to the transformation of his swim bladder into lungs; how little there was in all that the primitive reptile could see or surmise to warrant him in risking his neck in order to satisfy his longing to rise. Similarly each great advance in the progress of the human race, each great scientific discovery and invention, each step forward in religion has meant a leap forward into the unknown. And when the leap has been taken, the trustfulness has been rewarded and men have found

reality to be what they dimly hoped. In Jesus Christ humanity made its last great leap—a leap into a world where God the Father reigns, a world which is wholly plastic to the hand of God. From that attainment materialism and unbelief have dragged us back. Our Lord stands in our midst and says, as He said to His disciples, “Have faith in God,” make with me the great venture, taste and see how gracious the Lord is.

To that adventure He is calling us to-night. Your generation knows what a great adventure means. This Conference will call you to new adventures—the reconstruction of our industrial system on a truer spiritual basis, the establishment of justice in Africa, the extending of a helping hand to the peoples of Asia as they struggle to a new day. But greater than any of these adventures, giving you the power to succeed in them, is the spiritual adventure of daring to believe in the God and Father of Jesus Christ. What would happen if we heard that call? If we responded to it, not in our own strength but in the power of God’s spirit who is waiting to enter our hearts?

## THE TEACHING OF JESUS ABOUT THE KINGDOM OF GOD

R. H. TAWNEY

THE subject allotted to me is one on which no one could speak without considerable diffidence—a diffidence which is increased in my case because, until I reached this gathering, I did not realize that there were so many Christians in Great Britain. It may be said, I suppose, that the attempt to apply the teaching of the New Testament to the questions of social organization in itself involves the assumption of a highly disputable position. Religion is a matter of the spirit; to externalize it is to degrade it. The business of the Christian Church is not to pronounce opinions about the rights or wrongs of social organization, but to mould individual character. Their function is like that of the educator who must teach the truth as he sees it, without biassing his pupils' mind as to particular applications of it, in the confidence that it will find its own application for itself.

That position is one which has been taken up by some of the most spiritually-minded of men. It deserves respect. But their emphasis on the individual is, at best, a half-truth, and the half which it suppresses is precisely that which is most important for this Conference and for our generation to emphasize. The main note of this meeting, I suppose, is the consideration of the methods by which Christian propaganda may be made more effective among non-Christian people. But propa-

ganda is a matter of action and not of words. What persuades men is not speech or writing, but a way of life visibly expressed in a society which they feel enlarges their personality and makes them conscious of new powers. The main testimony to Christianity ought to come, not from Christian apologetics, nor even through individual Christians, but from a Christendom which is greater than them both.

And it is from Christendom, its international relations and its economic order or disorder, that the main argument against it is derived. I remember very vividly a conversation which I had some years ago with an Indian friend and the retort which I provoked when I tried to speak of the social ethics of the Christian religion. "I do not allude," he said in effect, "to the periodical paroxysms of mutual destruction which overtake European nations, to the systematic immorality of their great cities, or to their occasional relapses into government by terror among those races which are temporarily so unfortunate as to be subject to them. These things (he went on) are sins of the passions, from which, however odious, few peoples can escape. What bewilders the observer is not the occasional aberrations of the Christian nations, but their habitual conduct and organization; not their failures, but their standards of success; not their omission to live up to right principles, but their insistence that wrong principles are right. Your religion (he said) is a noble if paradoxical creed, which affirms that all men are brothers; that humility and poverty are blessings, and riches a dangerous misfortune; that the way of service and self-sacrifice is the way of happiness. I do not blame you for not reproducing those theories in your practice; evidently they are esoteric and not meant for daily life. What surprises me, however, is that in your practice you erect into a system the duty

and happiness of practising precisely the opposite. The normal condition of your social order is an economic civil war, which you hardly trouble to conceal. Your industrial system involves the regimentation of the masses of mankind by a few thousand rich men, who are individually, no doubt, innocuous, but who quite frankly regard their subjects as somewhat rebellious and inconvenient instruments of production. The normal canon, by which you judge those who have deserved well of the commonwealth, is how much money they have amassed, and to them you sell political power. Your creed is exalted, but your civilization is a nightmare of envy, hate, and uncharitableness. I would forgo the former in order to escape the latter, and I hope that my fellow-countrymen will escape the contamination of Christian society in order that they may continue to retain some of their own, not wholly un-Christian, virtues."

My friend's indictment may have been exaggerated. If it is, it is one which is on the lips of thousands who consider Europe to-day. And it is salutary that issues of that kind should be raised. To attempt to answer it by saying merely that religion is a thing of the spirit—as though the power of Christianity over the individual were precisely in proportion to its powerlessness in society—is merely to add to the indictment the charge of hypocrisy. It is idle for the emissaries of Christendom to endeavour to persuade non-Christian people to believe that the Christian faith contains a solution for their problems as long as Christendom itself preserves its purity by jealously guarding that faith from contact with its own. Issues which from one point of view are economic or political, are from another moral or spiritual. They determine the environment within which religion must work. They mould the character to which it must appeal. They settle whether the life of the individual

should be free or servile; responsible, or the sport of forces which it cannot control; one long struggle for individual self-advancement or against individual poverty so touched by devotion to some higher issue. You cannot, in fact, go on maintaining two standards side by side in the same society. You cannot call the individual to a life of service and self-sacrifice as long as the social environment within which he lives is dominated by a ruthless economic egotism. You cannot indefinitely have a Christian Church in a pagan society. Either, as in the past, the former will Christianize the latter, or, as in our own day, the latter will paganize the former. The real enemy of Christianity is not ignorance or apathy or indifference—the real enemy is a virile and militant creed, which affirms that the main end of man is to obtain the mastery over his fellow-men which is conferred by economic success. That faith is in itself a kind of religion. It is established at the very centre of our industrial organization, and only a faith can overcome it. If Christians are to be true to their creed, they must not nibble with pious phrases at the circumference, they must strike at the citadel and decline to be intimidated by talk of economic expediency into distrusting the social ethics of their own faith. They must insist that these ethics are not less obligatory because they often demand a corporate, as much as individual, effort for their expression. They must claim to try by Christian standards not merely individual conduct and personal behaviour, but the whole world of social relations and industrial organization and economic activity which itself is a part of conduct and on which the conduct and character of individuals ultimately depend.

It is not difficult to state the kinds of criteria which Christians should apply. Dr Gray will tell you better than I could. That human personality is sacred; that

the materialism which sacrifices the education of children, and the freedom of men to the supposed necessities of industry is an odious outrage on the image of God ; that it is as wrong to live idly upon property as upon charity ; that to take advantage of public necessity in order to reap the maximum of personal gain for oneself is not only ungentlemanly but a hateful denial of human brotherhood. Who can deny that to the Christian these things are platitudes ? Who can affirm that in the sad world of business they are other than paradoxes ?

But it is not enough merely to assert them. Nothing is more demoralizing than the perpetual repetition of principles which are so comprehensive as to apply to everything in general and to nothing in particular. If Christians accept the dangerous doctrines of human brotherhood, and of the sacredness of the individual life and of the duty of service, they are committed, it seems to me, to a quite distinct and definite attitude towards the main issues which confront our economic civilisation to-day. They are bound to insist that the standard by which society must be judged is the quality of the human beings it produces and not the wealth which it accumulates. They are bound to insist that no tolerable society can be produced as long as the economic activity which for most of us forms nine-tenths of our lives is dominated, as it is to-day, by motives of personal gain and advantage. They are bound to insist that an economic system which leads even good men to suppose that the first object of public economy should be retrenchment on the education of its children is a system which hangs a millstone about the neck of mankind. They are bound to work for such a transformation of industrial organization as may make industry a fellowship in communal service instead of a squalid struggle for personal advantage.

I do not mean that Christians ought to form a party or join a party—though, of course, I think they ought. What I mean is that they ought to insist on the social implications of their own faith, and to state them in such terms that their application to our present society is obvious.

When I am told that though the hearts of Christians burn within at the spectacle of social injustice, yet they are restrained from expressing their opinion by deference for economic principles or because they do not know what to do, I confess it appears to me a piece of self-mystification which is singularly lacking in plausibility. Christians need not feel that exaggerated reverence for economists. Economists rarely feel it for themselves, and they never feel it for each other. And, after all, Christians have both a right and a duty to let their attitude towards the main social issues of our day be known. We are deceiving ourselves when we say we have abolished the main abuses of more barbarous societies and that within the British Empire slavery is unknown and infanticide is discarded. We have not abolished them, we have abolished their names. Slavery is not the less servile because it is called casual labour and is an institution in London, nor does infanticide become meritorious because it is called infantile mortality and is tolerated in Manchester. After all, the Christian Churches are in the first place a society. They ought to be able to bring home the obligation of membership in that society to their own members. I should like to see them engaged in district visiting, for example, in the city of London, explaining the spiritual merits of a cheerful payment of Excess Profits Duty. They are great teaching bodies. They could see that every individual who comes in contact with them learns what Christians think and what the Christian tradition is

with regard to matters of economic conduct and social organization. They have a public position and status. They can let the powers of this world understand the sensations which are raised in their minds by the decision to save money at the cost of the rising generation, as though children were the one class which you never do wrong to defraud; by the spectacle of unemployment, of which we have been warned again and again during the whole of the past six years, and for which during those years up to this very evening no adequate provision has been made; by the mendacity which induced a body of trade unionists to suspend their strike on the promise of an inquiry, and when the strike was averted, broke the promise to carry out the report in which the inquiry resulted. Unless I am misinformed, even the children of light at different times in the not very distant past have found ways and means of bringing home to our authorities their own sentiments upon matters which they considered to be vital to their interests, as in the case of the Education Act of 1902 and the Bill for the Disestablishment of the Welsh Church. We cannot evade these responsibilities by saying they are economic or political instead of describing them as what they are—issues which are moral because they concern the relation of man to man and the conduct of human society. The world is waiting to-day for some voice which will lift these questions on to a spiritual plane. Its unrest is not merely economic, it is moral. Men seek not merely greater comfort, but a society which may offer freer scope for the development of personality and may be guided by nobler motives than those of personal gain. They desire, though they do not always know it, some synthesis of religion with the practical interests of their lives which may give their work a new dignity by relating it to a spiritual aim. I believe that, if they are true to

themselves, the Christian Churches have it in their power to offer it. I believe that by restating the social ethics of their own faith they can point the way to a society which may enjoy not only greater material comfort, but spiritual peace, because its social institutions and its industrial organization, and its economic activities, will be an expression not merely of economic convenience, but of righteousness.

## THE TEACHING OF JESUS ABOUT THE KINGDOM OF GOD

The Rev. A. H. GRAY, D.D.

I WISH to start from the point to which Mr Tawney has brought us, and to take my stand upon the truths he has been expressing. And yet I would also like to express in a few words of my own what seems to me the truth about the present situation.

If we are to make any progress it is plainly essential that we should analyse the evils which at present afflict mankind—the evils which have disrupted the world, and spread discord across the earth in the place of the international goodwill which we here long for. When we do so, we find that they all arise from a vice of wrong thinking. We have suffered from two radical delusions. One is that one man's good can be attained at the expense of the good of other men, or that one nation's prosperity can be founded on the oppression of other peoples. All history really constitutes a proof that that idea is profoundly untrue, and the present state of the world is a tragic demonstration that any such delusion is quite fatal to the life of the race.

The other fatal delusion is that material possessions, power, and luxury, are the supreme goods, and that therefore they must be the primary concern of human beings. We have thought that they bring life. And we have found that the rivalries which such a belief causes really bring death. So long as any such misconception has

power with us, it will be our destiny to come into fatal conflict with one another. Strife, both between individuals and between nations is the necessary result of any such belief.

Now if that analysis be true, it is very easy to state the only possible principle of world-wide reconciliation and social reconstruction. The principle is that one man's good is really inseparably bound up with the good of other men. The only hope of the world is that men everywhere should face the plain fact that they are brothers, and should learn in love to serve one another—that they should come to esteem goodwill above dividends, true fellowship above power, and love above all other precious things.

And all this is just a way of expressing the truth that the one solution of the world's problems is the Christian solution. Christianity offers us the one principle for all true statemanship, and all sound reconstruction in industry, commerce, and international relations.

Now there is a certain pleasure in coming to such a definite conclusion and also there is a very real snare. It brings one a very real intellectual satisfaction to have all our present evils traced to one root, and to see that one supreme principle offers us universal guidance in trying to rebuild our house of life. A certain sense of exhilaration and mental freedom comes to the man who believes he is able to say, "I know exactly what is wrong with the world and exactly how to put it right." And yet we stand before a very real danger at such a stage in our thinking. A new thought, even though it be a true thought and a great thought, does not necessarily affect reality. It does not necessarily bring a new world one inch nearer. All this analysis and exposition of principles is very necessary, and very valuable, but a great many people never get beyond the stage of playing with these thoughts as if they were

a new sort of intellectual toy. And while they play the agony and the waste go on unaffected.

I confess that for a time I did think that the very intensity of our sufferings and the certainty of the fact that Christianity is the only cure for them might drive mankind Christwards. I have been among those who have tried to expound the truth that is suggested in the phrase "Christianity or Chaos." I have had days when I thought the sheer compulsion of that plain alternative might determine men to choose Christ. I have imagined men saying to themselves, "Let us be Christians even though we don't like it, because that is the only way in which we can escape the agonies of war or the miseries of civil strife."

But it is now quite evident to me that that is NOT how things happen. Men and women do not become Christians under compulsion—either of the sword, or of logic, or of terror. It is not with a bludgeon of any sort that you can recruit for Christ. The Kingdom is not going to be built by those who take to it reluctantly as a last resort. It can only be built by those who take to it joyfully as a first and best resort.

The Kingdom is indeed the one hope of the world, but however clearly that may be proved by the logic of events, it remains an open question whether mankind are going to accept the Kingdom, and fulfil its conditions.

The proof of all this stares us in the face to-day. In spite of such unanswerable expositions of the real facts of the case as we have had from Mr Tawney and others, both to-night and often before this, the majority of mankind remain sceptical and cynical. Whole nations to-day are obviously both sceptical and cynical. What the majority of men do is to turn on us and say something of this sort, "After all, all that you are urging is that if only everybody would be good and unselfish there would be no

more trouble in the world. That no doubt is true enough, but then people are not good and unselfish : they do not accept the Christian way of life, and therefore Christian policies are impossible. We must just find some other way of worrying through and managing human affairs. It is no good trusting that people will be noble and unselfish, we know they will not, and we have to take material guarantees against their selfishness. It is no good expecting that men and nations will suddenly cease to be aggressive and covetous, we know that nothing of the sort will happen, and we just have to try to restrain them a little here and a little there, and on the whole set off one selfishness against another, so that no one shall run riot."

All this is often summed up in the old trite and superficial sentence, " Human nature has always been selfish and always will be." I believe it to be a slanderous lie, but it is commonly believed. And so the practical man deals in his policies with the lowest and the worst elements in our nature and just by so doing tends to discourage the life of all that is better.

A short while ago a speech was delivered in the House of Commons in which an employer told the house that he had found the secret of productiveness and harmony in his works. It lay, he said, in letting the men know that on no account would the boss consent to become a millionaire, and that the whole concern was going to be worked for the good of all involved in it, and through them for the common good. He was not a unique employer. Here on Clydeside we have men of the same spirit who, amidst all the heavy anxieties of the times, are striving to make industry a Christian thing. None the less that speech in Parliament was an unusual speech, and its reception was very significant. Men of all parties seemed on the whole to regard that employer as at best a kindly freak—a harmless but queer abnormality. I think the exact thing

said about him was that he was a most unrepresentative employer, and behind that saying lay a confirmed scepticism about the possibility of ever getting employers as a whole to accept such a solution of the industrial problem. And yet that is the way for which this whole conference stands. We stand upon the root principle that not only in industry but in all other matters, national and international, the only way of hope is the way of mutual consideration, and of putting the claims of the whole community before the claims of self.

And the world pronounces that an impracticable suggestion. If that's your way to solve the industrial question, then it's not going to be solved. If that's the way to a happy internationalism, then a happy internationalism is not going to come. If that's the way to a settlement of Europe or Africa, then they will remain unsettled. So say the loud voices of the world.

God knows they have ominous facts to point to. I have known quite a lot of men and women in my time who in their early days were caught and held by the ideals and the ways of Jesus. And I have watched them go out into commerce, industry, administration and politics. In two years or so MOST of them were sucked in. They were overcome by the existing machine. They found they could not hold out against the ways of the world. They got keen on the business of making a living, which may be all right, and then on the prospect of making a fortune, or a position, which turned out for them all wrong. And if nowadays sometimes memories of their early hopes and purposes return to pierce them with sharp stabs of regret, they shake off such feelings, and tell themselves that in the real world a man must compromise to get on. You see they think they have got on. And it is to such people the world points, and then turns to us and says, "Can't you see that in the real world real people find Christ's

way is not practicable." Now what have you and I to say to all this?

*Firstly*, we have to say plainly that of course the coming of a new world depends on men becoming Christian, and that we are well aware of it. It is a religious cure which we propose for the world's troubles, and a religious policy cannot be worked out by men who do not acknowledge God. This whole Christian proposal cannot be commended to men who judge all proposals in terms of dividends.

So long as men hold to the old standards of value—so long as they believe the great good things to be money, luxury, power, and fame—so long as they put material values above life values, so long will they repudiate this Christian solution. It can only appeal to the man who has learnt to put spiritual wellbeing above possessions, and goodwill among men above all thoughts of fame and power. In a word, it can only really appeal to the men who have discovered that love is the greatest thing in life.

And that means it can only appeal to Christians. It does not matter along what road men come to Christ. Some will come by a process of sudden conversion, and some will arrive only after a long process of mental and moral conflict. Some will be driven to Him by bitter experience of other lords who fail us. Some may seek Him in the first instance for their own sakes, and some will join His ranks because they share His passion of pity for others. Men come into the Kingdom from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south. It does not matter whence they come so long as they get in. But till they do get in they cannot possibly appreciate the Christian solution of the world's problems. By no conceivable means can Christian policies be commended to a man with a purely stockbroking mind—nor for that

matter to a man with a purely trade union mind—although once they have seen the Kingdom such men will find much to do for it, both within the stockbroking world and the trade union world. But the Kingdom must be seen first. Then, *secondly*, we have to go farther along this line. We have to face the fact that being a Christian always means sacrifice, and that working out Christian solutions may often mean worldly loss to individuals. I suspect that the “boss” in industry may have to go farther than forego the chance of becoming a millionaire—after all it would not bother most of us to have to do that. He may have to run the risk of being a failure for the Kingdom of Heaven’s sake. Christ could only plant a foundation for the Kingdom in this world through the supreme sacrifice, and its walls can only be built upon the same terms. The man who is first of all determined to have what is called a successful career, and only proposes to be a Christian as a secondary consideration, will never help to build the Kingdom. It does NOT pay to be a Kingdom builder.

And I would to God that you and I might face this to-night without any subterfuge. It is so easy to play with the idea of the Kingdom as a sort of mental pastime. The ideas it suggests are mentally enlarging and by their inherent quality inspiring. And yet even such ideas are worthless until they are put into practice, and sometimes the practice of them involves a great price. I confess I am always inclined to shudder when I hear it said of anyone that he has such noble ideas, or such fine ideals. I have seen men with fine ideals beaten all to fits in practice by plain men who had not an idea in their heads, but who knew how to do the kindly things in real life which cost much. I know a shop girl who gets a headache whenever she is asked to put two thoughts together, but who could give points to most university students when it comes to

the kind of friendship which is expensive. She simply can't make out what we mean by all this talk of the Kingdom, but year after year she goes on laying stones of the Kingdom in their places by splendid self-forgetfulness. She is not afraid of sacrifice, and a great many of us are when it comes to the point.

And yet Jesus left us in no doubt whatever about this point. "Ye shall be hated, despised, forsaken, persecuted." "If any man would come after me let him take up his cross daily." It would be well before we talk any more about the Kingdom to face up to the terms which its founder laid down, and if we cannot accept them, to keep silence.

And so I come *lastly* to face with you the question of whether or no Jesus asked too much of human nature. Is it true that the Christian solution is impracticable because it asks of men more than men will give!

Well, it did not prove too much to ask from Peter and John. It was not too much for Francis of blessed memory, nor for Luther, nor for the Pilgrim Fathers, nor for our Scottish covenanting forefathers, nor for the men and women whose memories we most jealously cherish. It has not proved too much for a great and unnumbered multitude who have really saved the race from moral decay. And they became willing to pay the price in sacrifice, not because they were different from us, but because they came under the influence of Jesus Himself. They found that "through Christ" they could do it.

This whole conference is daily building up a massive and many-sided argument or demonstration that the world needs Christian internationalism, and that there is no other way out of our present tragic woes. But if the conference is to accomplish anything real, and not end in talk, it must lead to the incarnation of that truth in a body of men and women who shall be willing to pay the price,

It must issue in an incarnate demonstration that this Christian way is a possible way.

And ultimately it is a possible way only to men and women under the influence of Jesus Christ. It is that power which makes men and women into Kingdom builders, just because it makes them willing to present their bodies as living sacrifices. It is the contagion of His spirit which empowers ordinary people to live His kind of life. Theology calls that power "grace." Names do not matter. The thing itself is demonstrably real. It is not merely the influence of an historic character. It is something more real and more persistent than that could be. It is something that penetrates life down to its detail, and that can be relied on as a constant and accountable thing. It is a force that sharpens all a man's powers, and vitalizes his whole personality. Those who have had most experience of it are sure that it can be called by no lesser name than the Spirit of the living God.

And if it be true that this source of power is always and for all men freely available, does not that fact change the whole situation! Forthwith the Christian solution becomes a workable and practicable thing. If it be too high and hard for mere human nature, it is NOT too hard for men and women in the grip of this power. The first great pioneers of the Kingdom were unlearned and ignorant men—more than that, they were to begin with morally unstable men—but this power in the end of the day made them amazingly effective. In moments of weakness and temptation they "considered Jesus," and as they did so His power came over them afresh. They found that because of Him they could not give in. They could not go back on Him. He had loved them too well for that. They had loved Him too well for that. And so out of weakness they were made strong.

I do not think that any of us need to be told how

poor is the material we can offer to God to work upon. We are by nature unreliable, and often slack. We are frequently perplexed, and often suffer from a desolating sense of loneliness. Cravings for mere pleasure force themselves to the front, and in our weakness we demand of life that we shall have a good time. Some of us have secret habits of which we are ashamed. Some of us know that we are always too susceptible to influence by others, and so make poor followers of any one lord. At times we grow timid. At times we are even vain and petty.

Oh yes, God knows all that is true. But it has been out of men of like passions with ourselves that God in the past has made Kingdom builders. Men and women like us have been willing for His sake to be poor and to be despised. Men and women once as inconstant as we are have been taught to carry on and then on again until the end.

There was once a Scotch mill girl who was by nature so timid that she could not cross Sauchiehall Street in Glasgow until someone came and took her by the hand. But this power came upon her and mastered her. It drove her out to Africa. It taught her to walk the jungle alone and at night, and to stand before angry chiefs till she had bent them to her will. It so magnified her that she is said to have reigned as a sort of white queen over a large territory. Her name was Mary Slessor, and I am certain that with all the authority behind her which comes from her great and queenly life, she would insist to you and me that there was nothing special in her, and that what the power of Christ did for her, it will do for you and me if we will only submit.

And I am certain too that she, and with her all the great company of her peers who have known the same power, would combine in saying further that they did not find the life of Kingdom building a burden and a pain, but that in it they found life full and free and glad. They

would laugh if we were to pity them. But they will pity us if we are afraid to follow, for they insist that in that way we shall lose our lives.

It **MUST** be a poor sort of life that is left for anyone who, having seen Christ, goes back on Him.

To you and me He has given a vision of a world reconciled and made one through Him. To you and me He has made it plain that it is we ordinary men and women who must work out the new world at a great price. To you and me also He makes a clear offer that if we submit to Him we shall not fail.

As I have sat in this conference and listened it has seemed to me that a loud and insistent call is coming to us. It comes from all over the world and in many notes. A strangely pathetic call comes from Africa—a call with a bitter note in it from India—a call that is also a groan from Eastern Europe, and a call partly of anger from certain millions in our own land who have been crushed and mishandled by a system that denies Christ in its very principles.

I cannot understand the heart that is not moved almost to agony by these calls. I cannot understand the young spirit that does not want at some point to expend its all to help to bring in a better world.

But I should have no hope in spite of all that, if it were not that yet another voice has spoken to us. It is the voice that says, "Lo, I am with you always," that says, "Greater works than these shall ye do," that says, "My grace is sufficient for you." It is **THAT** that makes the essential difference.

There is going to be a new world in proportion as we yield ourselves to the power behind that voice. But on no other terms.

And it is the voice of Him "Who loves us and gave Himself for us."

Can any of you resist that!

## THE CHURCH AND THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS

THE RIGHT REV. F. T. WOODS,  
Bishop of Peterborough

A DISTINGUISHED Scottish preacher has told a story of a young minister taking his first funeral on a dark January day in a country churchyard. The service was over and he, together with three elders, got into a carriage to go back to the house from whence they came. It was a tragic funeral. The young girl had been the pride of the village. No words were adequate to the occasion, and silence fell upon them as they drove along. At last one of the elders with a weather-beaten face looked at the young minister and said, "Life is a big thing and we must have big ways of looking at it." If I were to try and sum up what I want to say this evening I should say the Church is a big thing and we must have big ways of looking at it.

Yet the very word "Church" indicates to some a vague idea, which the moment we try to realize it as something tangible and concrete, eludes our grasp and defies definition. To others the word "Church" conjures up a picture of warring sects, wasting energy in internecine conflict, damming up by their strife and contention the water of life which they exist to supply. Yet you cannot be a Christian without asking yourself what you mean by the Church. You cannot live in any country in Europe without being confronted by buildings in towns and

villages which raise the question at every point. And you cannot believe in the Kingdom of God as we believe in it without asking yourself what is the relationship between the Kingdom of God and the Church.

I propose to address myself in the first place to a very simple question, and one which is perhaps not superfluous at a time like this—Is the Church necessary? There are those who would without much hesitation answer the question in the negative. We have been told not once nor twice during the last five or six years that the Church is played out. Yet no thoughtful man, I venture to believe, will be quite satisfied with that answer. For in asking whether the Church is necessary, you really raise another question even more fundamental, and that is—What think ye of Christ? If Christ was the unveiling of God, then the Church is necessary. For in thirty short years of the world's history, from the manger at Bethlehem to the open grave in Joseph's garden, God's character was thrown upon the sheet for all mankind to see, God's plan explained, God's love demonstrated. The demonstration was made in a few years, but it was seen only by the few people who happened to be alive at the moment. Yet this was the very gem and jewel of all periods in the world's history. Therefore there was obviously need for a society which should preserve the records of that life, and interpret the meaning of that picture to each succeeding generation. If you say that Christ was merely one of the greatest of the world's teachers, the question drops. If Christ was Incarnate God, then the Incarnation as inaugurated in His life had of necessity to be continued, and extended, in the living community which He founded.

I look at the question from another point of view, and I say that the Church is necessary from the modern standpoint of the world's need. We are all prepared to assume—it has been the theme of almost every gathering

in this hall since you assembled here—that the one hope of the world lies in Jesus Christ, in His Person, His ideals, His scheme of values, His Spirit. Now, if it be true that the one hope of the world lies in Christ, and if ever He is to be brought to bear upon the nations, upon groups of men and women, whether in the world of politics or industry, there must be some community, some society, some organization devoted to that Christ, embodying His ideals, accepting His values, trying to live by His plan, and inspired with His Spirit. In other words, if Christ is to grip the world the task will not be accomplished by means of a mere collection of free lances, however admirable or enthusiastic. It will only be done by the organized community which we call the Church. You have during these days been trying to envisage the scope of the enterprise to which we as Christians are committed, and the more the needs of the twentieth century have been borne in upon you, the more you must have felt that only a Christian community inspired by the Holy Ghost with a life lived in Christ, in God, can even attempt so colossal an adventure.

There is on all hands a vague dream of better things. The mind of millions is groping for something which they call a new world, and the supreme need is some motive power by which we of the twentieth century can get there. I need not go over in detail what the great adventure involves—it has been brought before you in this hall by men of more experience and more eloquence than myself. Think, for instance, of the League of Nations. If the League of Nations is to be permanent there must come a change of outlook in the nations of the world. That is easy to say; but it is a mighty task to accomplish. At present the League is nothing more than a political organization. It needs to be broad-based upon a foundation of considered opinion. There

needs to be a re-orientation of national ambition, away from mere national advantage to international fellowship, and this fellowship outlook can only be achieved spiritually. It will not necessarily be found in democracy. We young democrats of the twentieth century are rather disposed to pin our faith to democracy as if it was of necessity pacific and devoted to fellowship. But we have been told by those who know, and told in no measured terms, that there is no foundation whatever in history for any such assumption. This enterprise of christianizing international relationships will be impossible, unless the Church of Christ in every land can bend herself to the task. It is no doubt largely a matter of education. It is mostly a matter of conversion, for this fellowship-ideal came from Christ, and only through His impact can it get into the minds of the people. These fellowship-ideals are the dynamite of the new age, but it requires a world-wide organization and systematic spadework to inculcate them into the minds of the nations, to bring to bear their explosive force.

The same is true, obviously, as you can tell me just as well as I can hope to tell you, with regard to the industrial problems which face us here at home, and which have already been somewhat exhaustively dealt with from this platform. If you are to turn man's attention from the cult of private gain towards an ideal of industry as a national service, it means complete conversion. It will not be accomplished by any mere re-organization of the industrial machine, but only by the implanting of a new spirit, and that the Spirit of Christ. There are only two alternatives if our industrial problem is to be ultimately solved. The first one will be no solution; it is bloody revolution. It is useless to attempt to build a new world upon hate, and thus prepare the way for reaction in days to come. The way of violent revolution is simply the

acceptance of that doctrine which was the curse of the nineteenth century, and which our gallant men went to their deaths in order to extirpate, namely, the omnipotence of force as the deciding factor amongst men. The other alternative is the peaceful penetration of men's minds by the Spirit of Jesus Christ. When I say peaceful, I do not mean that kind of peace which means slackness or trimming of one's sails to whatever breezes blow, but the kind of penetration which calls for resolute sacrifice: for the maintenance of Christ's way of life at whatever cost, whether political, industrial, social, or personal. If this be so you must have a society calling for stronger loyalty even than patriotism in the ordinary sense of that word; an allegiance which transcends the allegiance due to any trade combine or union. You must have a society which gets below these political and industrial ideals, and raises the whole process to the way of life taught by Christ. You must have the Church. For after all it is personal conversion which it is the Church's business to achieve. It is the capture of personalities for Christ. This is the real road to social progress—a concerted and world-wide attack on men and women in the unconquerable power of the love which passeth knowledge, and their capture for the way of life which was taught by Jesus Christ. Such a campaign is unthinkable apart from an organized association of the most careful kind; a comradeship of those enlisted for the fray; a society into which those who are captured can be introduced and welded into the life of a great family circle. The Church, then, is necessary if Christ was the unveiling of God. The Church is necessary, too, in view of the modern world and its needs. This is only to say that the Church is necessary if, as we all believe in this hall, fellowship is fundamental to life. If God is essentially social—the doctrine of the Trinity is the expression by which this essential socialness of God has

always been taught—then to represent God in the world is far beyond the power of any individual ; it calls for the effort of an organized society. There must be a corporate reflection of God if men are to see God. I say that fellowship is fundamental to life. We of this generation surely do not need to be taught that. As we look back upon the past five or six years, we know it as few generations have realized it before us. I go back in thought to a conference at Liverpool in 1896, which I went to as one of the representatives of Cambridge University, and I think of the immeasurable change of outlook which has come across the world and the Movement since those days. Then, in large measure, we concentrated on the individual, now on the community. For only in fellowship can each man find his life. We need, therefore, a fellowship which can break down partitions ; which can link up men of goodwill ; a “beloved community” in which all truth and goodness and beauty can find its home.

Aye, and we want a community which extends further still ; a fellowship which can reach into the other world, which can break down even that partition, penetrate even that curtain and link up God’s men and women of every age past and present. That would be a fellowship indeed. The demand for it is irresistible, and the need immeasurable. Can it be supplied ?

That brings me to my second point, and it is this : Is there a Church, and what is God’s intention for it ? Obviously there are various bodies which call themselves Churches, but is there in God’s intention one great visible society by which pre-eminently He is to be represented, and to which pre-eminently His cause on earth is committed ? I answer that question fearlessly in the affirmative. How did it begin ? The question is often asked : “Did Christ found a Church ?” But the question is surely almost irrelevant. If Christ did not found the

Church, the Holy Spirit did, and the Holy Spirit is the risen and ascended Christ in action. St Matthew describes our Lord as speaking of "My Church." I do not stop now to discuss that phrase, but I venture to say that this, at least, is certain as we look over the great documents which have come down to us ; first, that at a definite time and place a tangible, visible, community of men and women was literally en-livened and empowered by a very breath of God ; that that breath of God, and not their own human association, welded these men and women into a compact society, and made that society powerful and magnetic. In the second place, it is certain that from the first, Baptism was the sacramental gate, and the breaking of the Bread the sacramental focus, of the fellowship. In the third place, the life of that community brimmed with a higher morality and a more exuberant neighbourliness than anything so far seen on earth ; further, that the society was committed to an enthusiastic propaganda which aimed at nothing less than the capture of men and women of every country for the new allegiance. Thus it is literally true to say that the Church was Catholic from the start. It knew no limits of race, no distinctions of class, but preached a universal religion claiming for its Lord universal allegiance.

It is only reasonable in the case of any community or institution that it should be judged at its best, and I ask you to think now for a moment or two of this Catholic Church at its best. What were its marks, what were its concerns ? Its first concern was worship. It was the result of a movement, if one may say so reverently, initiated by God, and that movement was always returning to God in prayer and worship. It is not without significance that the first Government Report, so to speak, about this new community puts this in the foreground of its activity. Says Pliny: "They sang a hymn to

Christ as God." He proceeds further to describe the new community, but that is the first mark—worship. And we shall never understand the Church and the worthy members of the Church until worship is put first: in other words, until our first concern is contact with God—casting our souls upon God, and receiving from God that which the world cannot give.

The next concern of the Church at its best was holiness—holiness of mind and of soul, and also, in a way which we of this generation and in these later days sometimes hardly realize, of body too. In a world honeycombed with every kind of wrong the members of the beloved community claimed to be the sphere in which emancipation from all ills could be found—from sin, from trouble, from doubt, aye, and from bodily disease as well. It was indeed the true "Liberation Society." As Origen said, "Look at Jesus, the Heavenly Physician. Come inside His room of healing, the Church," thus indicating a religion for the sick both in soul and body. Harnack has told us that—"Long before Christianity had achieved its final triumph by dint of an impressive philosophy of religion its success was already assured by the fact that it promised and offered salvation." This is the note which the Church ought to sound, more deeply, more keenly, and more energetically than sometimes it has done of late. Holiness, personal holiness, was what the Church was out for. And only in so far as you, its members, are becoming personally holy, saved from sin, transfigured into Christ's likeness, are you worthy members of the great community. Christianity is not merely or even mainly the religion of self-realization; it is the religion of redemption from all wrong; of conversion of will and transformation of character.

Our third and final concern, and I put this third quite deliberately, was brotherhood. It was a brotherhood

transcending all differences. It was so from the international point of view, for the first Christians looked upon themselves as a new race—a people of God united in a bond before which earthly distinctions faded. Listen to an early writer, Octavius: "We draw distinctions between nations and races, but to God the whole world is one household." And is it not Mr Wells who said only the other day that the Catholic Church was the first League of Nations? Quite true, and if it had not been undermined by worldliness the Church might have disciplined and guided the outburst of nationalism which followed the Renaissance and which paved the way ultimately for the great war.

If the Church's concern was fellowship between nations it was equally so between classes, between all men. Christ declined the rôle of the political agitator and social leveller, not because these things were too revolutionary, but because they were not revolutionary enough. He was out for the transformation not of life's shell but its core and kernal; to make men good citizens of earth He thought it necessary to make them good citizens of heaven. And, believe me, when the Church has put this true Radicalism in the forefront of its programme; has been really out for that change of mentality commonly called conversion—again I use that old-fashioned word—it is then that she has been most effective in her schemes of social reform. When we look back to those early days we find she was the most potent society in existence for the abolition of class distinctions and for the creation of a true democracy. The Church had a vivid sense of industrial brotherhood. Some of you have read that passage from the Didache in which this sense is so prominent: "If any brother has a trade let him follow the trade and earn the bread he eats. If he has no trade exercise your discretion in arranging for him

to live among you as a Christian, but not in idleness." In some places at least the Church was almost a Guild of Labour, encouraging members to work, providing for unemployment, but always on the basis of brotherhood in Christ—in fact it was a standing exhibition, to use an early phrase, of "love in daily exercise."

I turn from the contemplation of the Catholic Church at its best to the Church at the present moment, and I admit that, at first sight, the aspect is discouraging. The body of Christ is torn and broken, the very word "sects" suggests wounds, with arbitrary cuts and unnatural divisions. As to creed, far from recognizing the great standard of faith, we range from the ultra elaborations of Rome on the one side, to beliefs so shallow and vague that they lose themselves in a kind of morass of mere rationalistic morality. As to our effectiveness in the world, we are paralyzed by our divisions both in thought and in organization, so that the idea of Christendom speaking with one voice is almost inconceivable. Yet we need not be discouraged. The very fact that we are so conscious of these difficulties is in itself a step in the right direction. There never was such deep widespread dissatisfaction in the "beloved community" as to its divisions as there is at the present time. And we have got beyond the stage merely of mutual discussion. Our state calls rather for penitence, prayer, and the faith which can move mountains, and shews only through the valley of mutual humiliation and sacrifice can we come into that large place of union for which we hope.

Similarly, as regards the standard of truth, is it not true that there is a moving towards rather than away from the one standard of truth and faith to which Christ's men and women are committed? It is significant, as was pointed out long ago,<sup>1</sup> that those Churches whose

<sup>1</sup> By Charles Booth.

teaching is most clear and definite are, on the whole, those which appeal most to men and awaken the keenest response. We realize in those days the ineffectiveness of sloppy emotionalism and vague sentimentalism as substitutes for New Testament Christianity. There is a hunger on all sides, and I speak of this with conviction and experience, to know and grip afresh the fundamentals about God, and life and death and eternity, and the judgment. As to the charge of ineffectiveness, well, we admit it. But the Church's Foreign Mission work, let alone the work which goes on elsewhere, is surely its unanswerable apologetic. It is the one movement in the wide world which, putting all thought of gain on one side, goes forth in pure love and neighbourliness, in compassion for the men and women whom, for Christ's sake, it loves.

The last question shall be this: What is my duty to the Church? And I answer quite definitely: First of all, to believe in it! The attitude of cold criticism is not very difficult. The Church and the Church's failings have been submitted in these last years, and not least I presume in the circles you represent, to keen criticism and analysis. But remember "Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for it." And by the Church we are not to understand some vague idealistic company of unblemished saints, but the fellowship of human beings which was forged at Pentecost and which St Paul knew at Ephesus, which you know in London, or in Glasgow, or in Peking, or in Tokio. The fellowship! It was for this that Christ gave His life, and that because He would have a Body through which He could still function, the only body He has for reaching men. In that Body men are to see God, and through that Body God is to touch men. That Body is to be to the nations the mirror of God's glory, the agent of God's love. Its activities, so

St Paul explicitly states, are the object-lesson of God's working to angels, arch-angels, and to all the company of heaven. It is the vehicle in which the Christ goes out conquering and to conquer. I say, then, to you: Believe in the Church. Don't be blind to its defects but believe in it, because Christ believes in it, and went to all lengths to make it efficient for His service.

For the Church to-day is only the ante-chamber of the great Church of the future. We have no reason to suppose we are at the end of Church history: much more likely are we only at the beginning. The Catholic Church has come, but the Catholic Church is coming—the movement of the Spirit is unmistakable. Many men upon this platform and in this hall can testify from their own experience of the unifying movement of the Spirit in these days. Here you have been experiencing something of that movement. I shall never forget as long as I live how we, the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, experienced it in conference at Lambeth last summer. We believe that there was unveiled to us then a new vision of the Catholic Church—one world-wide family circle holding one standard of fundamental truth and faith, with one universally recognized ministry, and with one mighty mission to each generation of men and women as it comes; and yet a community wide enough to include in the same order groups of Christians something like our present denominations as we call them, in which all features of doctrine and devotion, which are according to the mind of Christ, should be made available for the whole community. I beseech you regard your Church, or your denomination, in the light of this. The supreme usefulness of any Church lies precisely in the contribution it can bring to the Catholic Church of the future. The greater its gifts, its riches, its experience, the more diverse its heritage, the greater its responsibility to share them with the whole family.

Therefore cultivate what is Catholic, and repress what is merely local and denominational. You remember the statesman who told England long ago to think imperially. I ask you in the Name of Christ to think imperially of His Church. The Church is a big thing. We must have big ways of looking at it.

But there is more. You must believe in it. You must prepare for it, you must present yourself for its service. The fundamental attitude of the true member of Christ's Church to the Society is not to ask what can the Church give me? but what can I bring as my contribution to the Church? What should we have thought of any man in the Army in days gone by who concerned himself with what the Army might be able to give him rather than with what service he might render to the Army and the Cause which it was summoned to defend. I would like to-night, if only I could in some humble way, to bring home to you the honour of membership in the Church of Jesus Christ; the honour of belonging to the great Community; to the Fellowship of two worlds; to help you to feel to-night the inspiration of "the victors who o'ercame." We join hands with the men and women, some our own dear ones, some who were predecessors in this Movement, with the men and women of every country and of every age, who are of the Body of Christ. As we break the Bread and drink the Cup we are members of a community who are committed to an adventure which thrills through all time, and especially through this tremendous moment in man's story. You have been brought face to face these days with problems, multifarious, deep, diverse, and difficult. You may have felt discouraged. I say to you to-night, God is available and the resources of God are for you. If His Church will but respond to Him nothing shall be impossible even in the twentieth century. God's hope is in His Church.

God believes in you. It is for you to receive the life, the energy which God alone can give. For after all our thoughts of the adventure and the fight; after all our efforts to envisage the scope of the great campaign; after all is said and done, what the Church fundamentally does is to receive God. It is not for you to build a new world, but for God to build a new world, working mightily through you in the power of His Spirit. That is the hope that is the glory of His inheritance through you, and for you is the exceeding greatness of His power. You will remember how the great apostle coming to the end of his life and looking back over his long experience in the Church of Jesus Christ sums it all up in those mighty words, so moving and so encouraging to us all: "For of His fulness have all we received as grace for grace." You go forth to-night, and in a few days you go back to life at College or the other paths which await you, having received God and realizing in humility and yet in unutterable joy that you are members of His Body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

## THE CROSS

The Very Rev. W. M. MACGREGOR, D.D.

I HAVE been asked to speak to you this evening of the Cross ; and there is no way in which I can more fittingly begin than by recalling to you the place which the Cross held in the thought of the Apostles. Paul describes the character of his whole message when he calls it (1 Cor. i. 17) " the word about the Cross," and he reminds his friends who had listened to him (Gal. iii. 1) that " Jesus Christ had been pictured before their eyes as crucified." With reverent wonder Peter asserts that even " the angels desire to look into the sufferings of Christ " (1 Pet. i. 11, 12), and he adds that what emancipates men from " a heartless, customary way of living " is nothing else than " the precious blood of Christ " (i. 18, 19). John, striking a distinctive note (1 John iii. 16), says of himself that he came to know what love means when he saw Jesus " laying down His life for us " : for John, that is to say, the Cross made love definite and concrete and intelligible. And when Paul (Gal. vi. 14) declares the principle or motive which governed him in his relentless activity, he still finds it here : " No boasting for me—none, except in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ ! For on it the world was crucified and became like a dead thing to me, and I, in turn, was crucified, and grew indifferent and unresponsive to it ! " Thus it would seem that in doctrine, in preaching and in conduct alike, the Cross was central for the Apostles. Ruskin, whilst admitting the high

purity of Wordsworth, says of him that he was "not curious to see in Christ's hands the print of the nails," and that is a defect which many of us share to-day. We claim the apostolic succession, and yet we have to deplore the Church's unfitness for its universal task ; perhaps the secret of recovering fitness lies in the restoration of the Cross to its apostolic place.

The theme is too great for the best of us ; but I should like to develop it a little by raising three questions which naturally present themselves. The Cross is not a mere historical object, an instrument of death erected at a particular date ; it is a symbol, a significant hieroglyphic, which invites our scrutiny.

I. The first of my questions is: *What does the Cross tell us about sin?* And to this the answer is simple. In the Cross, or gallows, or guillotine, society always proclaims the extreme of abhorrence for certain forms of offence. Disapproval is expressed by us all with widely varying degrees of energy ; certain faults are condemned, and yet we almost all indulge them. But somewhere, in every code, whether private or public, particular crimes are marked as beyond forgiveness ; with them no terms can be kept, for them there is no remedy except by way of extirpation. And it is with these the gibbet deals, so that it may be taken as a hieroglyphic sign, grim, unmistakable, of condemnation in its last extreme. Sometimes the offences singled out for this bad eminence are quaint enough. Herbert Spencer tells of a stern Arab who pronounced two sins alone to lie beyond the reach of mercy—the one is worshipping a creature, and the other is "drinking the shameful," or, in plain English, smoking tobacco. Perjury, adultery, murder itself might be excused, but not such crimes as these. The choice may be odd, but the meaning is transparent : here is something which society

dare not tolerate, which has to be abolished, or society itself is in danger. And it is this judgment of absolute condemnation which is embodied in the Cross. Cursed, says Paul, quoting from an older book (Gal. iii. 13, Deut. xxi. 23)—Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree!

This sentence of sheer extinction appears in varying figures in the Old Testament. Year by year, in early autumn, the offences of the nation were laid on the head of a goat (Lev. xvi. 21), and then the hapless beast was led away to the depths of the wilderness to perish, for life appeared unsafe so long as that evil thing persisted. In one of his visions (v. 5-11), Zechariah saw "the woman Wickedness" cast into a great box, which was sealed with a weight of lead and borne by flying messengers away beyond sight or thought; for wickedness embodied is a malignant thing, which threatens life itself whilst it remains. The high God, in one place (Jer. xlv. 4) exclaims, "Oh, do not this abominable thing which I hate!" But that fierce word is nothing like so emphatic as the grim symbol of the Cross, in which sentence is passed upon evil as hateful. And unless we share in that absolute condemnation of it we shall not travel far in explaining the mystery of the Cross.

We all know that the administration of law in this matter has been often blotted by iniquity and folly. Trifling offences have been ferociously chastised, and vile things have been indulged, and penalty has sometimes fallen on the guiltless. At a first look, we might be tempted to pronounce upon the Crucifixion simply as a monstrous example of judicial error; but only at a first looking. For when we consider it more closely, we cannot miss one feature of the spectacle. Luke tells (xxiii. 28) of women who followed to Calvary "bewailing and lamenting" Jesus, and he tells of the crowd who returned from the scene "smiting their

breasts" (xxiii. 48); but he nowhere hints at any protest or outcry from the Crucified. "As a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so He opened not His mouth" (Is. liii. 7). George Adam Smith comments that "silence under suffering is a thing absolutely new in the Old Testament. . . . The sufferer is always either confessing to God, or, if he is conscious of no fault, he is challenging God in argument: David, Hezekiah, Job are all *loud* under pain." But this Man, for whom such inflictions were surely never meant, was dumb. Whatever protest might be uttered, there was none from Him. If the Cross is the speaking symbol of a universal condemnation, then it would seem that here the Victim consents to that condemnation as righteous. He bows His head in silence, as if, on behalf of a world of erring men, He were confessing the hatefulness of sin. To Him it was "the abominable thing which God hates," for which no sentence short of abolition could be adequate. That is the witness of His silence, in which, more loudly than by any outcry, He proclaimed that death is what the sin of man deserves; and having made that evident, He said, "Father into Thy Hands I commit My Spirit."

II. But now for my second question: *What does the Cross tell us about the removing of sin?* Or, to put it otherwise, what justice or reason is there in appointing the Cross for Him, the Sinless One? "I lay down My life of Myself," He says in one place; or in the old Latin form—*Passus quia Ipse voluit*, He suffered because it was His will to suffer. But a man does not, of His own will, die thus in disgrace without some purpose, or hope, or outlook; and thus we come in sight of Christ's plan for redeeming men—a plan which was first presented in the 53rd chapter of Isaiah.

In our English Version the origin of the situation there

described is greatly obscured by the confusion of the tenses: pasts and presents and futures are jumbled together without reason, so that many readers never realize that the prophet is commenting on something which he had seen. He had watched a human life, and now he records his reflections upon it. The person he depicts was noble and loving and stainless, and yet on him there came not neglect only, but inflictions and persecutions of every kind. At first, his fellows paid no heed, or deliberately turned their eyes from so disconcerting a spectacle; but, in a while, the prophet began to think of what he had seen, and then he leaped to a great conclusion. It has been suggested that the unnamed sufferer was Jeremiah, and his figure may serve as well as another. He took his stand against the religious custom and opinion of his age; and the courtiers, and his fellow-prophets, and the mob, and even his own kinsfolk united in making life bitter for him. But he held to his task. When his warnings came true and disaster overtook the nation, he was offered ease and honour at the court of Babylon, but refused it, for that had no place in his plan of life. He loved his people though they railed at him, and he could not bear to forsake them in calamity; so he chose to share the misery of the remnant in the land, and when, in sheer despair, they moved down to Egypt, he went with them for he had no interest and no life apart from theirs. And in the end, he died by violence in exile at the hands of the very people he had striven to save.

That is an astonishing story of what human love and loyalty can endure—how it refuses to be parted even in thought from its objects, how it bears all things, and hopes all things, and never fails. Whether it actually is Jeremiah's or some other ideal figure which haunts the chapter, it does not greatly matter; what is important is that the prophet, brooding over that example

of undiscouraged love, leaps to the conclusion that this must be God's way of righting the extreme of wrong. As long as upright people stood aside, protesting that the errors and calamities of the bad were their own concern, disasters only increased; but for individual or nation or the world the secret of recovery lies in the principle of the communion of life. The innocent, just because he is innocent, must refuse to be parted from the guilty; the strong and full life must willingly accept the burden of the weak and defeated. Wisdom and faith at their highest are a reason not for separating but for refusing to separate from the unwise. And this indissoluble fellowship of the good with the faulty is God's instrument, says Isaiah, for bringing in a better order.

Now it is worth noticing how persistently temptation assailed Jesus at this point. It was in His heart to help men on the large scale—to deliver and transform, and to reign as King; but surely these ends might be secured without the Cross and the bitterness which led up to it. That was pressed upon Him in the wilderness, and rejected by Him; but it returned in a word spoken by Peter (Luke viii. 32-33), and the fierceness of His retort shows how near the temptation came. When He was moved by some wandering Greeks asking to see Him (John xii. 20), this temptation was renewed: "Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? Shall I say, Father, save Me from this hour? But it was to resist just here that I came to this hour." And thus again He prevailed, and looked without dismay to the Cross. But the same temptation broke in upon Him in Gethsemane, like the desolating sea. He was a young man, with a life to live, and He had to face the shattering of His work, and the assaults of human hatred. "If it be possible," He pled that night, "let this cup pass from Me!" But He had "come to give His life a ransom

for the many," so He mastered the instinctive protests of His human nature, and offered Himself willingly at the last. Thus, from the beginning on to the close, no touch of separate interest was admitted. For Himself He asked nothing, but resolutely took His share with His erring, hostile fellow-creatures. "When we were yet enemies,—*enemies*, Christ died for us."

Theologians have often interpreted this in far too legal a fashion, as if by some arbitrary appointment Jesus was taken as the representative and substitute of the human race. But Isaiah suggests a better way of approaching the relation; for there is nothing arbitrary or legal about his programme, but only what is human and ethical and intelligible. We all are interested in the question how men can be enduringly helped and the world raised to a worthier level; and Isaiah's answer, and (what is of greater consequence) Christ's answer is that such effects attend not the vague benevolence of an outsider, or even the efforts of some one holding to a policy of limited liability. Men can be helped, and the world can be set forward, but only by some one who is willing to pay the price and to go all lengths. When Montaigne was invited to be Mayor of Bordeaux, he consented, but with a significant reservation: "I am willing to take the city's affairs on my hands, but not on my heart or my liver." That is to say, I am prepared to do something, but not to make myself ill on your account. But on that line, no lasting renovation need be looked for: a man who is going to change the world must give himself to his task without reserve. That is a principle not confined to our Lord Jesus, though in it, as in all things, He is supreme. Paul boldly speaks of himself as "filling up that which is lacking of the sufferings of Christ" (Col. i. 24), for Christ's work can only be carried on in Christ's way. To show how far this principle will carry us, he says again (2 Cor. iv. 12): "Death

worketh in me—I am dying on my feet ; but what of that when life is working in you ? ” There in operation you see this principle suggested by Isaiah, and worked out by our Lord Jesus, by which the world is to be changed ; you see a man nobly careless of what happens to himself if only he may stand by his fellows and raise them from the sloughs in which they are foundering. Or listen to Paul again, for he actually lived and died on this plan, “ I do not count my life dear unto me, if only I may finish my course and the service I received from the Lord Jesus.”

That is a principle which works. Even on the human level it proves itself effective. In the Book of Revelation (xii. 11) it is recorded of the brave that “ they *overcame* the Evil One by the blood of the Lamb (for Christ’s sacrifice is first), and by the witness they bore, and because, though they had to die for it, they did not cling to their life.” That is the secret of victory in human society. The world, in all its parts, is being lost by isolation ; and the world can be, and it is, redeemed in no other way than by this identification of interest between strong and weak, between good and bad, whatever of sacrifice may be involved. The blood of the martyrs has been the seed of the Church, and not of the Church only ; for progress has been made, and the stiff world lifted from the ruts, whenever men, in love with truth, have ceased to think about themselves.

“ By the light of blazing martyr fires  
Christ’s bleeding feet I track,  
Toiling up new Calvaries ever,  
With the Cross that turns not back.”

What sometimes puzzles me is, why those who see the truth of this as applied to society stumble at it when it is offered as the secret of the influence of Jesus Christ. They see the reason of it in ethics, and yet disown it in theology. They find it unjust that He should suffer, the innocent for the guilty ; and yet this rule of identification of life is surely

a general human secret—identification without limit or reservation, so that the patriot and his country are inseparably one, the leader, unconquerable in courage, and his broken army, the Redeemer and those who are to be redeemed. Apart from that oneness of life there can be no effective service. All the misery, privation and disgrace they have procured are accepted by Him; and all His strength and hope and clearness flow out from Him to them. In its highest application theologians speak of the working of this principle as a "*mystical union*." All that is ours He takes home to Himself and makes it His, because He actually loves us; and what is His, by a true transfusion of life, passes over into us. It is a poor thing to stop at a knowledge of Jesus as a preacher of righteousness calling us to a better life, or as an example of righteousness calling for our imitation, for these we might find in moralists lying outside the Christian pale. To see ourselves as we are is much; but the great Christian transformations are wrought in those who first see Jesus associating Himself with them, and who then, in one high act of faith, are able to associate themselves with Him, making His confession theirs, and His hope theirs, and His victory theirs. My one right to forgiveness stands in that loving association in which He suffers for what I did as if He had done it, and in which I, who can do nothing aright, rejoice in what He did as if I had done it. That was Isaiah's picture of God's way of mending the world, and our better sense should approve of it as just.

III. Some of you in whom the social sense is active would allow that this plan of identification of life is a noble human programme, but they doubt if it can be achieved: they doubt if this way of sacrifice can ever bring more than a mitigation of the world's evil. So my third question comes: *Is God in this?* or, in other

words, Is victory going to crown it? Isaiah, after watching a life in which this method had been illustrated, arrived at the conviction that this must be God's plan for mending a broken world. John records that, through seeing Jesus laying down His life for men, he came to know the love of God; and Peter (1 Pet. i. 21), speaking for the whole Christian community, declares that through Jesus they had become believers in God.

That is to say, these men all attained to their conviction not directly (for God is the most secret of beings), but by a process; and so must we. Throughout their months of fellowship with Jesus, the feeling deepened in the disciples that this Man must be what God is like. They discovered in Him such fulness of being, such ease and mastery in every situation, that admiration deepened into awe. But what impressed them most was that, above all men, He had the giving nature. He gave without ceasing and with both hands, so that every creature He laid hold of was constrained by gratitude. The people He most commended were those who shared in this noble profusion—the widow who gave God all her living, and the woman who *broke* the flask of ointment, so that it was squandered in one glorious gush of fragrance. That is My way, He said of her: “wheresoever this Gospel shall be preached in all the world, the deed of this woman shall be told for a memorial of her.” For her act and Mine are close of kin; we both are spendthrifts, with no desire to stint or hoard, but when we give, to give all we possess. That temper bound His days together and gave them character, and a friend long afterwards said of Him, “Out of His fulness we have all received, wave upon wave of grace.” But that which had filled His life culminated in the last hours of it. Love is like fire, which may smoulder and burn obscurely, present though not yet triumphant. But, in a while, it burns itself

clear; the smoke dies down, and the flames leap high, and fire is known for what it is when it really takes command. And that was witnessed in the Cross, where love appeared without disguise or obsuration, love and nothing else than love. And there where human nature reached its height, and was altogether self-forgetting and magnanimous,—there, says John, I came to know the love of God. God also has no separate ends: He gives and gives with both hands. “The eyes of all wait upon Him, and He gives them meat in due season; He opens His hand and satisfies the desire of every living thing.”

And He gives in the only way that counts. The true giving is always a kind of sharing, for the worthiest gift is a bit of our life, and that is what the Apostles discerned in the Cross. When God gives, it is Himself He gives: “He so loved the world that He gave His Only Begotten Son.” The disaster of a world all gone astray is recovered by a Divine Sacrifice. So this, of which I have been speaking, is more than a human plan. It is God’s way of redemption, and what He does cannot finally be frustrate.

Thus we have followed our theme from level to level. I noted first in the Cross a grim hieroglyphic of the determination to make an end of what is base, and I bade you mark the meaning of His unprotesting acquiescence in that judgment of condemnation. We saw His plan for mending the world by a voluntary associating of Himself with it in all its misery and guilt. And finally, with reverence and awe, we have seemed to discern, with Apostles and saints, more than His plan; this is God’s way. “God was in Christ,” says Paul, “reconciling the world to Himself . . . and He has committed to us the message of reconciliation.” That message is not best conveyed in words, but in lives like

to Christ's own. He has told us that unless we take up our Cross and follow Him we cannot be His disciples; and the Cross, as we have seen, means identification of interest with the ignorant and the suffering and the bad. It means a life without selfish ends; it means the filling up of what is lacking in the sufferings of Christ. In Paul's great word (2 Cor. v. 15), it means this, "He died for all, that they who live should no longer live unto themselves but unto Him Who died for them and rose again." It is that way victory comes and a new world. *Dieu le veult!* It is the will of God, and we must not think that that can finally be frustrated.

## THE POWER OF GOD IN HUMAN LIFE

The Rev. W. R. MALTBY

THOSE who by the proceedings of this week have been helped to see the world as it is, and who still hold to it that it is not Christianity that has failed, are almost compelled to say that Christianity has not been tried. It is the refrain of almost every speaker that only Christianity can save the world, yet not the Christianity that is in possession, not Christianity as advertised, so to speak. There is indeed every reason why we should take heed and beware of censoriousness, for there is nothing more objectionable than a young pharisee, except an old one. If we criticize the Church we will remember that it is the Church itself which supplies us with those noble standards by which we judge it. The Gospel itself is the indictment of the Church which proclaims it, and of us who have professed to believe it. There are, we must believe, vast resources available to the Christian and to the Christian community, but at present unused, and it is better to allow the Christian message to shame the messengers than to allow the messengers to discredit or discount the message. This should lead us, not to the disgusting habit of patronizing our grandfathers, but to the quite practical question whether we ourselves are dealing honestly with a religion which always gives more than it demands, even though it demands our all.

It is part of the irony of our plight to-day that the

world is so much worse than any one intended it to be. Weakness, ignorance, and wickedness have combined into something so much more cruel than any calculated cruelty. Those who contrived the war, did not intend *that* war; and those who made the strange thing we call a Peace, did not intend its consequences. The slow murder of millions by artificial famine does not represent even the baser mind of Europe. Not being an imaginative people we can in this country make great mistakes in government, and we are generally obstinate in our mistakes, but, after all, no one *intended* the Black and Tans.

At the present time we function below ourselves. In international affairs we know that we are capable of nobler public action than we now exhibit. At home we work a social order which we do not really believe in. Those who defend it only advise us to hold to it as small boys are advised

“Always to keep a hold of nurse  
For fear of finding something worse,”

yet all the time something within us tells us that we ought to create a better order. In one's gloomier moments it almost seems as though our virtues were palsied while our vices were effectual. The good that we would we do not, the evil that we would not, that we do. The Churches are discussing their neurasthenia, but the profiteers are counting up their money. The idealists are looking disconsolately for one another, but the publicans are celebrating a victory. The baser things seem well organized and sufficiently articulate. But the better mind of the nation, the old virtues, the magnanimity, the trust in freedom, the instinct for justice, the habit of tolerance, even when tolerance is costly—these are for the time largely inarticulate. It was a

weakness in Elijah to think that he was the only true worshipper left, but it should be remembered in extenuation that the other seven thousand were in caves, and feeding on bread and water.

The cry for a great spiritual leader is not insincere to-day. There has been a long spiritual famine. The suspense of hope has continued till the tension is hard to bear. For all the time, as many of us believe, there are immense numbers in our land who await the authentic call. Were there to-day one great prophet who could speak to the soul of the nation, unify our scattered and impotent aspirations and lead the way, he would have such a following as our age has not known, and they would carry his banner over the world.

Civilization, which has made our individual isolations a thing of the past, has woven us all into a gigantic complex, where it is no longer possible for any man to live to himself, where the consequences of his acts pass out of his sight to work good or mischief afar off almost as soon as they are done. This civilization shows itself capable of enormous power, but it has only intensified and set in relief the ancient moral problem. The sense of moral defeat on a vast scale has penetrated the mind of our time, and the confession of impotence is an undertone that pervades all our thought. The modern world as a whole, like any poor wretch of a sinner, complains, "to will is present with us, but how to do that which is good we cannot find."

We cannot look on all this with the detached sense of mere spectators. We are all too deeply involved in it. The world is what it is, not because of the superlative wickedness of a few bad men. The ordinary selfishness, prejudice, ignorance, and laziness of mankind work up to this sum of wickedness and cruelty. If we see around us a world which cannot unify itself, cannot

exorcize its baseness or steadily pursue the visions it has seen, cannot even keep its wounds from festering, some of us remember a story very like all this, much nearer home. If a man cannot unify his own life, need he wonder that the world at large cannot do the greater thing? The world's paralysis has its counterpart in our personal moral weakness. If at times we have known that the life of each one of us might be a thing of beauty and a joy for ever, and we have not made it so, we shall not be censorious but penitent when we see whole nations reproducing in tragic ways our own most personal failure. The problem is the same for the wide world and for each single life. The world cannot live without more faith and hope and love, neither can you or I. Where can we find those all-prevailing things? Is there no secret of moral reinforcement which will retrieve this dismal story of defeat?

From a rather unexpected side there is striking evidence that such a reinforcement of the human personality is, in the deepest sense, a natural thing, a thing for which we were made. Even our physical frame bears witness to it. The psychologists are showing us that the human body only attains its maximum efficiency under a high spiritual voltage. Our bodies were manifestly intended to be more highly and more spiritually energized than they usually are. Nerves and muscles give out, but they give out because hope and confidence have given out first. Our physical frame is not over-tasked but under-motivated. The body would do the second mile well enough if the mind would keep blithe about it.

The evidence is abundant. You may begin with the shell-shocked neurasthenic of whom Dr Hadfield tells, who was totally exhausted after the smallest effort, in spite of manful resolutions to the contrary; but being

hypnotized and rehearsing the hour of danger again, he hurled heavy furniture across the room and fought with such strength that it took four men to hold him in. But the surprising thing was that when he came to, the four men were exhausted but he was refreshed. He announced himself as feeling distinctly better.

You may take the case of a lady, bedridden for years, who would often struggle to be brave and do something, but always fell back exhausted and rang the bell for more sympathy and more nurse. But when, in the providence of God, some one fired the bed curtains, she sprang up and fought the fire out, and then found herself so much better that she decided not to return to bed.

These are abnormal cases, but there is a chain of analogous facts, broadening out into familiar incidents of ordinary experience, and pointing to some definite and startling truths about ourselves. Many of us could recall some occasion when some powerful motive or exceptional emergency has quickened us when we were ill or exhausted, and carried us clean out of the stage of exhaustion and right through tasks of unusual difficulty. It was such an experience which made a writer speak of the thrill of the time when he discovered that he could do three times as much as he had ever done before. So William James declared that we habitually "energize below our maximum, and behave below our optimum." "The chief cause of fatigue," says Dr Hadfield, "is not exhaustion but stagnation." The normal channels of power are somehow obstructed, and they are obstructed chiefly because we do not believe in our real resources. We are living far within our physical possibilities and we cannot do many mighty works, the psychologists say, because of our unbelief.

But if the very psychologists endorse this hope of some great reinforcement by showing that even our

physical frame is waiting for it, there is for Christian people a more challenging witness. There is indisputable historical evidence of its having actually taken place, and the classic example is to be found in the records of the New Testament.

The New Testament might be described as the manual of power. It is full of the evidence of power, but the most obvious witness is St Paul. I know that some people, younger and wiser than I, say that St Paul does not appeal to them, and this reflects seriously on St Paul. I understand that he is now quite penitent about those letters, and is anxious that they should be forgiven and forgotten, as soon as some of you will kindly rewrite them more to the purpose. Only if any of you are going to try, you must achieve at least as much as he did when he tried. That is to say, you must leave on the mind the picture of a nature *superlatively energized*. You must reveal the secret of a new, transforming, and communicable experience, by which the whole personality was amazingly exhilarated and enhanced.

This is what St Paul's letters do. There is nothing in literature like that reiterated attempt to express the strength and volume of this surging life that made them more than victorious. In the effort to tell it, he strains the language and mangles the grammar, so that it takes Dr Moffatt weeks to execute the necessary repairs. But even more significant than what he says is what he and others among those first Christians did. Absurdly unequipped as they were, with nothing but their message and their joy, they challenged the whole confederacy of evil powers, and not only challenged those tremendous odds, but felt the humour of their doing so. "God chose," they said, "the weak things of the world to shame the strong, and the silly things to confound the wise, and the nonentities to make an end of the mal-entities." They

confronted the social cleavages of their day, Jew and Gentile, male and female, slave and free, and declared all disabilities annulled in Christ, conferred on all alike the freedom of the City of God, and saw their word take effect. They moved among cities which stank of moral corruption and had to find a Gospel for men polluted by devouring passions, but they did not advise such people to try and creep back to something like decency again. Their message is a very different one. It is as though they rose from the Father's table and ran out without their hat to fetch this their brother in, just as he was, assured that if he would but come, he would find everything to make him clean and put him in his right mind. The decisiveness of St Paul's strategy in the battle with sin takes your breath away. For every man, however shameful his fall, however terrible his passions or wasted his strength, there is always a splendid option—not a bare escape, but a full tide of obliterating forgiveness, of love and joy and peace. "There is a new creation whenever a man becomes united to Christ." "Anger, malice, lust, uncleanness, covetousness," he cries, "Put them all off"—as though it were a coat. "Put on the new nature. Put on the new mind. Put on the new mood. Put on Christ." Can we suppose it possible to use language like this unless one were appealing to an experience which made it intelligible?

I know of course that those first Christians did not all live at anything like this level all the time. There was no mechanical guarantee for spiritual victory then, and there is none now. The gifts of God may be indefinitely impoverished for any one of us when our response to them is unworthy or something short of genuine sincerity. So St Paul quite truly but paradoxically has to keep telling his converts to remember that they are dead and buried, and reminds them how indecent

it is for a man to forget his own funeral once it has taken place. If a Christian meets his old self—emerging in some evil thought—he ought to say to it, "What are you doing here? When Christ found me we buried *you*." Being morally free, a Christian *may* play fast and loose with the grace of God, and by the fittfulness or feebleness of his response, obscure the reality of what has come to him, and show scarcely a trace of the characteristic Christian quality. It is therefore all the more remarkable that the number of lapses or the poverty of the average quality never persuades St Paul to modify his language or tell his poorest converts anything less than that "all things" were theirs. The choice for every one of them was not a choice between different grades of respectability, but between living in the world of "self" and living in the kingdom of grace.

Here, then, are to be found men actually in possession of a transforming experience of God whose results are *on the scale of the fundamental Christian affirmations*. The life and power which these men enjoyed reads like a miracle—but it ought to do so if Christianity is true. It is a damaging thing to-day that the meagreness of the current religious life throws doubt on the tremendous assertions which it ought to verify. We demand proportion, and just as it must be incredible that the infinite God should have become man chiefly in order that ministers should have adequate Sunday congregations, and that congregations should have adequate Sunday clothes, so, on the other hand, the Incarnation becomes gloriously credible if the result is to retrieve our moral defeat and bring the sons of God to their own at last.

When the exuberant life of the New Testament is thus put in evidence, it is sometimes objected that St Paul, the chief spokesman, was a religious genius, that his temperament and experience were both abnormal.

It was his gift, but not ours, to live after that exuberant fashion.

If any one had used such language to St Paul himself, I think he would very likely have delivered the objector to Satan, as on another occasion, that he might learn not to blaspheme. For such language would have been blasphemy in St Paul's ears, and with good reason. This transforming experience of God was the most personal, but also the least private thing in the world. It was not St Paul's happy way of looking at things, but God's glorious way of doing things, that gave him such zest and courage. They rejoiced because of the glory of God, that is, because God was what He was. This transforming discovery of God was so essentially communicable that they conceived they had no higher business in life but to communicate it. If it was not for every one it was an illusion, for, in that case, they were wrong about God, and their whole message fell to the ground. There are legitimate varieties of Christian experience, and these varieties may depend on such things as varieties of temperament; but underneath these variations there is such a thing as the characteristic Christian experience, and it stands not upon our idiosyncracies, but upon the character of God. If God is what Christ revealed Him to be, then the relations between ourselves and God ought to be of a certain kind, and if the relations are of that kind, then power and freedom and joy simply cannot be kept out. In Christ men have found God coming out of the inaccessible distances and drawing indescribably near. "Here is all friendliness and joy," said Luther. "The God that we have seen with our eyes and our hands have handled," says St John, with endless wonder. They had not thought that God could be so human or come so near, or that they could ever be so much at rest in His company. That befriending Presence changed the

whole world for them and all their joy and peace and energy rose straight out of their intimacy with God. And *our* deliverance from moral impotence is to come, not by magical communication of something called "power," but by knowing God as He really is, and dealing simply, humbly, and frankly with Him.

It is, of course, not possible to make the power of Christ completely intelligible to those who are outside of it. You cannot make the experience of being in love intelligible to those who have never known it, least of all when the experience is of the nobler kind. But we are none of us entirely outside the power of the Spirit of Christ. Do we not all know enough of ourselves and enough of God to be sure that when the emptiness of life fills with the presence of a Love that will neither let us go nor let us off, that embraces the world and yet "thinketh upon us," that breathes reconciliation and silences all discords and puts our souls in health—that then we have the treasure of life indeed? Everything we touch has a new significance, and every day in that divine company is worth while. For observe simply one immense consequence. That fellowship kills fear, and fear is the poison that inhibits all our best impulses. If a man lives in a world of which self is the centre, every other man is a potential rival, and every change a possible evil. Consciously or subconsciously he is always on the defensive, and he lives in a fear-haunted world. But when a man's interest has come to be in something which the world did not give and cannot take away, when, having found God, he goes on to discover Him everywhere, and all life becomes a fellowship, that man has nothing left to fear. This really has happened. Christ said it would happen, and it will have to happen again. In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus promised His disciples three things—that they would be entirely fearless,

absurdly happy, and that they would get into trouble. It came to pass. They did get into trouble, and found to their surprise that they were not afraid. They were absurdly happy, for they laughed over their own troubles, and only cried over other people's.

Think of it! What might be done to-day if there were a band of men and women who found God nearer than anything or any one else, and who had lost—the fear of being hurt, the fear of being unpopular, the fear of being poor? Anything might be done.

But you may say that Christians have always believed this kind of thing, and yet no miracles happen. No, forgive me, whenever they really believe it, miracles do happen. They think they believe it, but that is another thing. With many people the top layer is believing; the next layer is pagan; and at the bottom is a poor, starved soul crying out for God. A doctor told me the other day of a surgeon who is performing many difficult operations without the aid of anæsthetics. He "suggests" to his patients that they will not feel pain, and they don't. There came into his surgery one who knew him, who loudly professed his scepticism about all this "nonsense." "Well, perhaps it is nonsense," was the reply, "but all the same you can't get off that rug." He tried, and found to his disgust that he could not. After an interval the surgeon said to him, "You can get off now"—and he got off—"but you can't get on again." And not even with the help of a run from the other end of the room could he succeed in getting himself over the edge of that rug. I am told that the case is not a very rare one. Superficially, the man was a sceptic; subconsciously he was already more than half persuaded.

Our case with religion is often the other way round. Superficially we are believers; subconsciously we are

unbelievers. With some, the quickening truths to which we have assented, perhaps too easily, have never penetrated the region of our primary impulses and our habitual and instinctive reactions, and the proof of this arrest is seen in the fact that a revolutionary faith has worked no revolution. We have our moments when we practise the presence of God; we scarcely realize for how long we have unconsciously practised the absence of God, and provided ourselves with a complete organization working automatically and adapted for carrying on without God. We cannot tell what a mass of dense, stubborn and stupid unbelief lies underneath the surface with most of us. The most intractable problem in the world is to get the glorious reality of God in Christ down into the subconscious regions of our nature, so that we are held by it rather than holding to it. Our natures cannot work aright until faith is no longer an effort against the grain, but the master-passion of the soul. No effort of will can accomplish this. If it were not the very thing the Spirit of Christ came to do, it would be vain to strive after it. But since it belongs to the character of God to do this thing for us, we have the right to expect it. It will help us to the right kind of expectancy if we remember that God does continually beset us behind and before, seeking an entrance and watching for the moment when the habitual mood relaxes and the better mind comes. Sometimes the simplest thing will be enough—the stroke of a church bell, the sight of a star, the speaking silence of a quiet night, a little child's voice, two bars of music, three words and a memory—any of these or a thousand others, and the long-closed door opens, and the next five minutes may be worth a lifetime. Even then it will need some pains and self-discipline to keep the communications open and maintain the fellowship, and we may fail there as elsewhere. But we can never be the

same again, for we know where life and power are to be found.

You must not let that moment pass whenever it comes—not even if of a sudden you find the moment is now. For the sake of your fellows, if not for your own sake, you must not and will not put away deliverance and power. Such an assembly as this cannot be gathered except at rare intervals, and I do not know where in the world one could find an assembly with more incalculable potency for good, or more fitted to stir the best that is in us. You will not refuse yourselves and He will not refuse us. Because He is what He is, He will take us on as we are, and find a use for every power we have. Let Him deal with us on His own scale and in His own way, and we shall have nothing left to ask.

## APPENDIX

### BRITISH UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES REPRESENTED

\* Represented by both men and women.

† Represented by women only.

#### England

BEDFORD—  
Kindergarten.†

BIRKENHEAD—  
St Aidan's.

BIRMINGHAM—  
The University.\*  
Carey Hall.†  
Day Training.†  
Handsworth.  
Kingsmead.\*  
Saltley.

BRADFORD—  
United.

BRIGHTON—  
Municipal Day Training.†

BRISTOL—  
The University.\*  
Baptist.  
Moravian.  
Western.

BURGH—  
St Paul's.

CAMBERLEY—  
Royal Military

CAMBRIDGE—  
The University  
Cheshunt.  
Girton.†  
Homerton.†  
Newnham.†  
Ridley Hall.  
Training.†  
Westcott House.  
Westminster.

CANTERBURY—  
St Augustine's.

CHELTENHAM—  
Training.†

CHESHUNT—  
Bishop's.

CHESTER—  
Training.

CREWE—  
Training.†

DARLINGTON—  
Training.†

DERBY—  
School of Art.†  
Training.†

## DURHAM—

The University.\*

## ELY—

Theological.

## EXETER—

University.†

## GLOUCESTERSHIRE—

Domestic Science.†

## KENT—

South-Eastern Agricultural

## KNUTSFORD—

Ordination Test School.

## LEEDS—

The University.\*

Rawdon.

Training.†

## LINCOLN—

Theological.

## LIVERPOOL—

The University.\*

Edge Hill Training.†

## LONDON—

Bedford.†

Birkbeck.\*

Borough Road Training.

Clapham High School.†

Day Training.\*

East London.\*

Froebel.†

Furzedown.†

Gipsy Hill Training.†

Goldsmith.\*

Graystoke Place Day Training.†

Guildhall School of Music.†

Guy's Hospital.

Hackney.

Home and Colonial, Wood

Green.†

Imperial College of Science.

King's.\*

King's Domestic Science.†

## LONDON (continued)—

Livingstone.\*

London Hospital.

Maria Grey Training.†

New.

Pastor's.

Regent's Park.

Richmond.

Royal Academy of Music.†

Royal College of Music.†

Royal Dental Hospital.

Royal Free Hospital.†

Royal Holloway.†

St Bartholomew's Hospital.

St John's Hall, Highbury.

St Katharine's Training.†

St Mary's Hospital.\*

St Mary's, Paddington.†

St Thomas's Hospital.

School of Economics.\*

School of Medicine for Women.†

School of Oriental Studies.

School of Tropical Medicine.†

Southlands.†

Stockwell.†

University.\*

University College Hospital.

Westfield.†

Whitlands.†

Working Women's College.†

## MANCHESTER—

The University.\*

Baptist.

Day Training.†

Didsbury.

Hartley.

Lancashire.

Mather Training.†

School of Technology.

United Methodist.

## MIRFIELD—

House of the Resurrection.

## NEWCASTLE—

Armstrong.\*

College of Medicine.\*

NOTTINGHAM—  
University.\*  
Congregational.

OXFORD—  
The University.  
Home Students.†  
Lady Margaret Hall.†  
Mansfield.  
St Hugh's.†  
St Hilda's.†  
St Stephen's House.  
Somerville.†  
Wycliffe Hall.

PORTSMOUTH—  
St Andrews.

READING—  
University.\*

SALISBURY—  
Theological.

SALOP—  
Harper Adam's Agricultural.

SHEFFIELD—  
The University.\*  
City Training.

SOUTHAMPTON—  
University.

SUNDERLAND—  
Technical.

TRURO—  
Diocesan.†

WANTAGE—  
St Michael's.†

WELLS—  
Theological.

WHEATLEY—  
Cuddesdon.

### Scotland

ABERDEEN—  
The University.\*  
Training.†  
United Free Church.

DUNDEE—  
University.\*  
Training.†

EDINBURGH—  
The University.\*  
Coates Hall.  
College of Art.\*  
Congregational Hall.  
Free Church.  
Medical College for Women.†  
New.

EDINBURGH (*continued*)—  
Provincial Training.†  
St George's Training.†  
Women's Missionary College.†

GLASGOW—  
The University.  
Anderson's Medical.  
Baptist.  
Provincial Training.†  
Queen Margaret.†  
St Mungo's Medical.  
School of Art.†  
United Free Church.  
West of Scotland Agricultural.

ST ANDREWS—  
The University.\*

### Wales

ABERYSTWYTH—  
University.\*  
Calvinistic Methodist.

BALA—  
Theological.

BANGOR—  
University.\*  
Bala-Bangor.  
Baptist.  
Normal.\*

CARDIFF (*continued*)—  
Medical School.†

CARMARTHEN—  
Presbyterian.

BARRY—  
Training.†

LAMPETER—  
St David's.

BRECON—  
Memorial.

NEWPORT—  
Caerleon.

CARDIFF—  
University.\*  
Baptist.

SWANSEA—  
Training.†  
University.

### Ireland

BELFAST—  
Queen's University.\*  
Assembly's.  
Methodist.

DUBLIN (*continued*)—  
Alexandra.†  
Church of Ireland Training.†  
Royal College of Surgeons.

DUBLIN—  
Trinity.\*

LONDONDERRY—  
Magee.

### Universities and Colleges Represented †

	Men.	Women.	Total.
Universities, Colleges, and Hospital Schools .	63	91	154
Theological Colleges . . . . .	53	4	57
Foreign Universities and Colleges . . . . .	29	26	55
	<u>145</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>266</u>

† Where a college is represented by both men and women it is counted twice in these statistics.

### Number of Delegates

	Men.	Women.	Total.
British Students . . . . .	819	800	1619
Delegates from other lands . . . . .	287	111	398
Professors and Tutors . . . . .	64	29	93
Speakers, Missionaries, Visitors, Representatives and Members of Missionary, Social, and other Societies . . . . .	200	138	338
	<u>1370</u>	<u>1078</u>	<u>2448</u>

## Countries Represented at the Conference

Africa.	Iceland.
Armenia.	India.
Australia.	Italy.
Austria.	Japan.
Belgium.	Korea.
Bulgaria.	Lithuania.
Burma.	New Zealand.
Canada.	Norway.
Ceylon.	Poland.
China.	Portugal.
Czecho-Slovakia.	Roumania.
Denmark.	Russia.
Dutch Guiana.	Serbia.
Egypt.	South Africa.
France.	Sweden.
Great Britain and Ireland.	Switzerland.
Greece.	United States of America.
Holland.	West Indies.
Hungary.	